

The Concept of *sdom pa* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*: On Possible Misunderstandings of the *Brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti**

Kishino Ryōji (岸野亮示)

Introduction

The community of monks and nuns, known as the *Saṅgha*, is one of the three crucial components of Buddhism, along with the Buddha and the *Dharma*. Once a *saṅgha* disappears, it is difficult, if not impossible, to revive it. No one could doubt, therefore, that the act of producing new members of the *saṅgha*, ordaining monks and nuns, is indispensable for the survival and prosperity of the Buddhist tradition.

The manuals giving the rules and procedures for ordination are included in the *Vinaya* “monastic law code.”¹⁾ An ordination carried out without strict adherence to the rules and procedures prescribed in the *Vinaya* is regarded, in principle, as invalid.²⁾ Therefore, the *Vinaya* is undoubtedly an important text concerning the Buddhist tradition.

* Originally presented at the international conference “Buddhist Nuns in India” held at University of Toronto, April 16–17, 2011, and largely revised for this publication. I wish to thank Professor Gregory Schopen for many corrections and suggestions of the earlier version of this paper. I have greatly benefited from critical readings of the current version by Dr. Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Professor Shayne Clarke, which led to a significant improvement of this paper. I am also indebted to Mr. Kadoya Warren for his careful check of the English. Special thanks also to Professor Onoda Shunzō (小野田俊藏), who gave me insightful comments at my presentation based on this paper at Bukkyō University (December 24, 2014). This acknowledgement, however, does not imply their entire approval or agreement. All errors are my own.

There are six *vinaya* texts that are generally thought to be *fully* preserved and affiliated to six different schools.³⁾ Since each of the six includes ordination manuals, these *vinaya* texts are instrumental for understanding the details of the ordination ceremony. Indeed, many — in particular, Japanese — scholars have referred to the six texts in their studies of ordination.⁴⁾ These studies were, however, primarily focused on male ordination. Although there have been some references to the general differences between male and female ordinations,⁵⁾ detailed information about the ordination ceremony for nuns is not yet sufficiently available.

In recent years, the issue of the revival of the *Śaṅgha* of nuns in the modern world has received considerable attention.⁶⁾ Coequentially, more and more research has been conducted that focuses on female ordination as described in the *vinaya* texts. Than (2007), for example, compared the formal ecclesiastical acts regarding female ordination that are found in the six *vinaya* texts, and noted several important differences between the described ordination procedures. One of the differences he noted is that the Tibetan translation of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* refers to the technical concept of *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* which is supposed to be given to the female postulant on the path to nunhood through a formal ecclesiastical act.⁷⁾

Unfortunately, Than did not use any Sanskrit sources in his research. Moreover, he did not refer to the *Kṣudraka-vastu* “Chapter on miscellaneous matters” of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* at all. This chapter, despite its title, includes the details of the procedures of female ordination, as well as many rules that apply exclusively to nuns. As a result, Than did not notice that Tib. *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* is an attested translation of Skt. *brahmacyāropasthāna-saṃvṛti*, nor that Edgerton’s *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary* referred to *brahmacyāropasthāna-saṃvṛti*. In addition, he was fairly uncertain about the precise context in which *tshangs*

par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa appears. In fact, Than, pointing out that it is exclusively mentioned in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*,⁸⁾ stated merely that “what *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* precisely means is not clear.”⁹⁾ Than’s simplistic statement might be an indication of the little attention that modern *vinaya* researchers have given to this technical concept, since few, if any, modern researchers have dealt with it in their *vinaya* studies.¹⁰⁾

Among modern Tibetan Buddhists, however, *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* seems to be well known. Although it is not certain whether they have realized that Tib. *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* is a translation of Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, or that Edgerton briefly refers to Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, they appear to have come to a consensus that it is a crucial component to female ordination, serving as a sort of “vow.”¹¹⁾ In general, female ordination is regarded as consisting of two ceremonies: the first is carried out by the *saṅgha* of nuns alone, and the second is then led by the *saṅgha* of monks.¹²⁾ The *Kṣudraka-vastu* prescribes that *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* be given at the end of the first ceremony. Most of the modern Tibetan Buddhists, thereby, seem to assume that *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* is the prerequisite for the postulant to continue on to the second ceremony. In fact, some modern Tibetan scholars go so far as to call the formal ecclesiastical act of giving *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* “*brahmacya* ordination.”¹³⁾ It should also be noted that the significance attached to *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* seems to underlie modern Tibetan monks’ rejection of female ordination in their tradition. That is, it seems to be claimed that when there is no *saṅgha* of nuns, no one is able to give *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* to female postulants, and consequently, no women can be fully ordained.¹⁴⁾ As we will see, however, this much significance is neither

attributed by Edgerton, nor implied in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Instead, it seems that *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* might not be particularly significant, at least to the redactors of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Thus, the concept *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* is worth discussing for at least two reasons. First, it may not yet be sufficiently known to modern Buddhist scholars. Second, it seems to be assumed by many Tibetan Buddhists to be something significant, thereby, hindering the revival or the first establishment of the *Śaṅgha* of nuns in Tibet,¹⁵⁾ though such assumptions might be unreasonable.

In this paper, I first discuss how *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* appears in the descriptions of the procedure for becoming a Buddhist nun in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (§ 1). Second, based on the fact that *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* is an attested translation of Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, which Edgerton mentions as one of the *-saṃvṛti* compounds specific to *vinaya* texts, I explain Edgerton's interpretation of *-saṃvṛti* compounds including *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*. Furthermore, noting that the last word of the *-saṃvṛti* compounds referenced by Edgerton is translated into Tibetan as *sdom pa*, I show that in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* there are several other *sdom pa*s that are given to monks, nuns, or even laymen through formal ecclesiastical acts and can be best understood in the same sense as Edgerton suggests (§ 2). Third, I note the interchangeability of Tib. *sdom pa* with Tib. *gnang ba* as translations of Skt. *saṃvṛti* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and thereby, conclude that Edgerton's interpretation of *-saṃvṛti* compounds is well supported by the Tibetan translation (§ 3). Then, I note that there are rules that govern the giving of *saṃvṛtis*, including *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, the transgression of which amounts to a minor offense in the Tibetan translation of the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* “the

commentarial section of the provisions for nuns” of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (§ 4).¹⁶⁾ Finally, I conclude that in terms of a *vinaya* requirement for ordination, the meaning of *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* (*brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*) might not be as significant as modern Tibetan Buddhists have thought. In addition, I refer to one of the possible reasons why such excessive significance has been attached to *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* in Tibetan Buddhist tradition.

§ 1 *Tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* in the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*

The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* includes a description of the entire procedure for becoming a Buddhist nun in the *Kṣudraka-vastu*, which is preserved both in Tibetan translation and Yijing's 義淨 (635-713 CE) Chinese translation. Yijing, however, seems to have omitted the detailed description of the ordination ceremony for nuns,¹⁷⁾ just as he appears to have done with the description of the ordination ceremony of monks in his Chinese translation of the *Pravrajyā-vastu* “Chapter on entering the religious life” (*Chujia shi* 出家事, Taishō 1444).¹⁸⁾ There are also two compendia detailing the formal ecclesiastical acts of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, both of which include the formulae giving the procedures for female ordination. One is preserved in Yijing's 義淨 translation (Taishō 1453) titled *Baiyi jiemo* 百一羯磨 “101 Formal Ecclesiastical Acts,” and the other is preserved in Tibetan (Derge 4118) under what appears to be the same title: *Las brgya rtsa gcig pa* (**Ekottarakarmaśataka*) “101 Formal Ecclesiastical Acts,” which, unlike Yijing's 義淨 version, is attributed to a famous medieval *vinaya* master, Guṇaprabha, who is thought to have lived between the fifth and the seventh centuries CE, and maintained close connections with Mathurā.¹⁹⁾ Though there are several significant differences not only in authorship but also in

content and structure between these Chinese and Tibetan compendia,²⁰⁾ the formulae for female ordination found in both texts appear to correspond well with each other.²¹⁾ Furthermore, the formulae for female ordination found in the Tibetan **Ekottarakarmaśataka* and the Tibetan *Kṣudraka-vastu* are also in agreement.²²⁾ We have, therefore, the complete procedure for female ordination of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* detailed in at least two Tibetan translations and one Chinese translation.²³⁾ In addition, the Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācanā* “formulae of formal ecclesiastical acts for nuns” found in Nepal (dated 12th-13th century CE) also include, albeit incomplete, formulae for the ordination of nuns, which are now known to correspond well to those preserved in the Tibetan *Kṣudraka-vastu*.²⁴⁾

Thus, there are Tibetan, Chinese, and Sanskrit texts extant and available to us that cover the procedure of female ordination in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. According to these texts, after having completed the two years’ training in the so-called Six Rules (Skt. *ṣaḍ-dharma*) and Six Incidental Rules (Skt. *ṣaḍ-anudharma*),²⁵⁾ a female probationer (Skt. *śikṣamāṇā*) should be given *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* by the *saṅgha* of nuns through a formal ecclesiastical act. The process before the formal ecclesiastical act of giving *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* consists of the following five major steps:

1. The formal determination of the Preceptress (Skt. *upādhyāyā*)
2. The declaration of taking formal possession of the five robes and the bowl²⁶⁾
3. The formal determination of the Nun-Who-Inquires-of-Postulant’s-Obstacles (Skt. *raho’nuśāsakā*)²⁷⁾
4. The preliminary inquiry of the postulant’s physical obstacles
5. The giving of *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*

The fifth step begins with the postulant's request for *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, followed by the inquiry about her physical obstacles which, unlike the preliminary inquiry (i.e., the fourth step), is conducted in public, and ends with the formal ecclesiastical act of giving *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*. In the *Kṣudraka-vastu* extant in Tibetan translation, the motion of the formal ecclesiastical act is prescribed as follows:

Then, a motion must be made: “May the community of noble sisters listen! This one named so-and-so wishes for the full ordination through the Preceptress named so-and-so. [She] is a “married” woman who is less than “twelve years old”/²⁸⁾ an unmarried woman who is more than twenty years old, has the five robes and the bowl, and has declared herself completely pure in regard to the obstacles [to becoming a nun]. This one named so-and-so whose Preceptress is this one named so-and-so, asks for *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* from the community of noble sisters. If for the community of noble sisters, right time has come and [it is] allowed, the community of noble sisters should authorize [that] and the community of noble sisters should give *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* to her, this one named so-and-so. [Her] Preceptress' name is so-and-so.” This is the motion.²⁹⁾

After this motion has been proposed, the resolution accompanied by a single proclamation is taken as follows.

The resolution also must be taken as follows: “May the community of noble sisters listen! ... (The passages from the motion are here entirely repeated)... In the community of noble sisters, those who allow the giving of *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* to this one

named so-and-so, [whose] Preceptress is this one named so-and-so, should remain silent! Those who do not allow [it] should speak!

The community of noble sisters gives *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* to her, this one named so-and-so, [whose] Preceptress is this one named so-and-so. The community of noble sisters allows and authorizes [it] and therefore remains silent. Just so, [I] hold it.”³⁰⁾

The ritual procedure I presented above is not informative regarding *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* itself. They do not contain any information on the meaning of the title “*tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*.” They suggest, however, that giving *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* does not impose any additional requirements on the postulant, but rather, reaffirms the postulant’s fulfillment of the already established requirements for becoming a nun: suitability of age, possession of the five robes and the bowl, and purity regarding the physical obstacles. Taking the fact into consideration that the inquiry of the postulant’s physical obstacles, which includes questions about her age and her robes and bowl, is immediately conducted in response to her request for *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*, the postulant’s purity of the physical obstacles seems to be the main factor in giving *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*.³¹⁾ That is to say, the context of the ritual procedure suggests that *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* is what is given to the postulant as a certification that there is no physical problems that disqualifies her for ordination.

§ 2 *sdom pa* = *saṃvṛti*

Several sources attest that Tib. *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* corresponds to Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*.³²⁾ Needless to say, it is important to first consider what this Sanskrit compound means in order to shed further light on *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*. It may be a good start to look at Edgerton's *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, since it refers to *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* in the entry “*saṃvṛti*.”

Edgerton (*BHSD* s.v. *saṃvṛti*) notes that Skt. *saṃvṛti* might be equivalent to Pāli *saṃmuti*, and suggests that its verbal root might be \sqrt{man} .³³⁾ Furthermore, referencing three *-saṃvṛti* compounds found in *vinaya* texts, he gives “consent in the sense of a formal vote (of the saṃgha)” for *saṃvṛti* particular to *vinaya* texts. The three *-saṃvṛti* compounds mentioned there are *śaikṣa-saṃvṛti*, *avandanārha-saṃvṛti* and *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*. *Śaikṣa-saṃvṛti* appears in the third rule of the four *pratideśanīya*-offenses in the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* manuscript of the Sarvāstivādins. The rule states that monks, unless invited, may not intentionally visit and receive food from the householder who has been formally acknowledged as *śaikṣa* by the *saṅgha* of monks.³⁴⁾ Edgerton quotes the beginning of the rule “*yāni punas tāni (kulāni) śaikṣa-saṃvṛti-saṃmatāni...*” and translates it as “families which have been held by formal declaration to be *śaikṣa*.” Though Edgerton does not comment on this *śaikṣa* at all, the *Shisong lü* 十誦律, a Chinese *vinaya* text of the Sarvāstivādins, explains it in detail. According to the explanation, a devout householder who has donated more than he can spare to Buddhist monks must be acknowledged as “*śaikṣa* (*xuejia* 學家)” by the *saṅgha* of monks through a formal ecclesiastical act, so that they will not receive additional alms from him in order to save him from spending all his money on alms for

Buddhist practitioners.³⁵⁾ Both *avadanārha-saṃvṛti* and *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* are found in the *Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācanā* from Nepal (first edition), which is now known to be closely related to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.³⁶⁾ This close relationship may be demonstrated by the fact that the formulae of formal ecclesiastical acts regarding *avadanārha-saṃvṛti* and *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* are preserved in the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* and the *Kṣudraka-vastu*, respectively, of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. The *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* refers to *avadanārha-saṃvṛti* as what the *saṅgha* of nuns must give through a formal ecclesiastical act in regard to a monk who has received a formal ecclesiastical act of suspension (Tib. *gnas nas dbyung ba'i las* = Skt. *utkṣepaṇīya-karman*³⁷⁾) from the *saṅgha* of monks, and therefore, is unworthy of reverence. After giving *avandanārha-saṃvṛti* to the monk, the nuns of the *saṅgha* must no longer show reverence to him.³⁸⁾ Edgerton quotes “*samagreṇa ca bhikṣuṇīsamghena avandanārha-saṃvṛtiyā saṃmataḥ*” and translates it as “(an expelled monk) who by the entire congregation of nuns has been judged by formal vote that he is unworthy to be saluted.” *Brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* is the principal *saṃvṛti* that we discuss in this paper. Edgerton does not give any specific explanation of it, much less its Tibetan translation. He simply quotes the sentence “*brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛtiṃ yācitavyā*” and translates it as “she must be made to ask for permission to enter the religious life.”

Edgerton's comments on *-saṃvṛti* compounds leave much unclear about *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*. The meaning of the title “*brahmacaryopasthāna*,” for example, is not discussed at all. It should be noted, however, that Edgerton's interpretation of *saṃvṛti* as “consent” or “permission” seems to lean in the same direction as the context of female ordination points regarding the meaning of *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*. As we saw above in § 1, the female ordination procedure suggests that *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* (Skt. *brahma-*

caryopasthāna-saṃvṛti) should only be given to the postulant when the *saṅgha* of nuns determines that she is qualified to be ordained. Edgerton's interpretation of the *-saṃvṛti* compounds seems to be primarily based on the correspondence between Skt. *saṃvṛti* and Pāli *saṃmuti*. However, the Tibetan translations, which are not referred to by Edgerton, also suggest the validity of his interpretation, albeit in a roundabout way.

Just as *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* is translated into Tibetan as *tshangs par spyod par nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*, *śaikṣa-saṃvṛti* and *avadanārha-saṃvṛti* are expressed in Tibetan as *slab pa'i sdom pa* and *phyag bya ba'i 'os ma yin pa'i sdom pa*, respectively.³⁹⁾ In these two cases, we can once again recognize the equivalence of Skt. *saṃvṛti* = Tib. *sdom pa*. In fact, there are several other *sdom pas* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that are intended to be given to members of the Buddhist *Saṅgha* through formal ecclesiastical acts, as follows:

smyon pa'i sdom pa: This *sdom pa* is given to a crazy monk (*smyon pa*) who may be absent from the *poṣadha*-ceremony, which is usually performed by all monks together.⁴⁰⁾

'khar ba'i sdom pa and **dra ba'i sdom pa:** These *sdom pas* are given to old or sick monks who wish to take possession of a walking stick (*'khar ba*) and a net bag (*dra ba*) for carrying bowls.⁴¹⁾

bu dang lhan cig tu khang pa gcig tu nyal ba'i sdom pa: This *sdom pa* is given to a nun who has just given birth to a baby boy and wishes to sleep with him in the same building without breaking the rule that forbids nuns from sleeping in the same building as males.⁴²⁾

gnyen dang lhan cig 'dre bar nye spyod kyi sdom pa: This *sdom pa* is given to a nun who wishes to travel to a village alone in order to stay with her relatives in the event of a famine.⁴³⁾

'khor gzhag pa'i sdom pa and **'dod chen gyi 'khor 'jog pa'i sdom pa:** These

sdom pa are given to a nun who wishes to have a pupil or many pupils.⁴⁴⁾

lo gnyis su chos drug dang rjes su mthun pa'i chos drug gi bslab pa'i sdom pa:

This *sdom pa* is given to a female novice (Skt. *śrāmaṇerikā*) who starts two years of training in the Six Rules (Skt. *ṣaḍ-dharma*) and the Six Incidental Rules (Skt. *ṣaḍ-anudharma*), making her a probationer (Skt. *śikṣamāṇā*).⁴⁵⁾

Each of these *sdom pa* is not immediately confirmed as a translation of Skt. *saṃvṛti*, but can be best understood in the sense that Edgerton (*BHSD* s.v. *saṃvṛti*) suggests: formal “consent” or “permission” that must be obtained by those who wish or need to do something unusual or special. It is not easy, however, to associate Tibetan *sdom pa* with this meaning. Moreover, Tib. *sdom pa* is conventionally used as a translation of Skt. *saṃvara* rather than Skt. *saṃvṛti* in Buddhist texts.⁴⁶⁾ It may appear, therefore, that Tibetan *sdom pa* does not corroborate Edgerton’s interpretation of *saṃvṛti* as “consent” or “permission” at first sight. When we carefully read the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and other related texts, however, we find an interesting interchangeability of *sdom pa* with another Tibetan translation, which directly supports Edgerton’s explanation of *saṃvṛti*.

§ 3 *sdom pa* = *gnang ba*

Petra Kieffer-Pülz, in her discussion about the Sanskrit compound “*ekaṣoḍadhāvāsa-saṃvāsasaṃvṛti(t)yā*” that frequently appears in the *Poṣadhavastu* “Chapter on the *poṣadha*-ceremony” of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, acknowledges Edgerton’s suggestion and notes that the last word of the compound *saṃvṛti(t)i* is always translated as *sdom pa* in the Tibetan transla-

tion. Furthermore, she notes the equivalent of Skt. *saṅgha-saṃvṛti* = Tib. *dge 'dun gyis gñang ba* in the *Prātimokṣa-sūtra* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*,⁴⁷⁾ and suggests that *sdom pa* may be a synonym for *gñang ba* “Erlaubnis.”⁴⁸⁾ Haiyan Hu-von Hinuber, in her Sanskrit edition of the *Poṣadha-vastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, also refers to Edgerton (*BHSD* s.v. *saṃvṛti*), and notes that in the *Poṣadha-vastu*, Sanskrit *saṃvṛti* is almost always translated as Tibetan *sdom pa*, except for one case in which it is translated as Tibetan *gñang ba*. Furthermore, she suggests that this dual translation might indicate Tibetan translators’ insufficient awareness of the similarity in meaning between Skt. *saṃvṛti* and Skt. *saṃmati*.⁴⁹⁾

Apart from the cases that have been noted by Kieffer-Pülz (1992) and Hu-von Hinüber (1994), there are several other examples indicating that both *sdom pa* and *gñang ba* are interchangeably used as the equivalent of Skt. *saṃvṛti* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* and other related texts.⁵⁰⁾ One of the most evident examples is found in the fourth major part of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, which is now called “*Uttaragrantha*.” Many have noted that the Tibetan translation of the *Uttaragrantha* has come down to us in two versions: the *'Dul ba gzhung bla ma* and the *'Dul ba gzhung dam pa*,⁵¹⁾ and the former seems to be incomplete since it only contains a part of the so-called *Upāli-paripṛcchā*, while the latter contains about ten texts (or chapters) in addition to the full version of the *Upāli-paripṛcchā*. It is also already noted that there is no significant difference between the two *Upāli-paripṛcchās*, except for some translational variations.⁵²⁾ One of these variations between the two *Upāli-paripṛcchās* explicitly demonstrates that *sdom pa* and *gñang ba* are essentially used interchangeably in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

- The *'Dul ba gzhung bla ma* (Derge 7 Na 73b6):

bitsun pa bcom ldan 'das kyis yang dge slong gang gang zag bsnyen

*par ma rdzogs pa la gnas ngan len gyi ltung ba brjod na dge 'dun gyis
gnang ba ma gtogs te ltung byed do zhes gsungs pa gang lags pa / ...*

- The 'Dul ba gzhung dam pa (Derge 7 Na 149a7):

*btsun pa bcom ldan 'das kyis yang dge slong gang dge 'dun gyis sdom
pa stsal pa ma gtogs par bsnyen par ma rdzogs pa'i gang zag la gnas
ngan len gyi nongs pa smras na ltung bar 'gyur ro zhes gsungs
na / ...*

Both passages contain the same question asked by Upāli about the seventh *pāyantikā*-offense, i.e. the rule that forbids monks from telling laymen about the serious offenses committed by other monks.⁵³⁾ Upāli quotes the rule itself in the question. The underlined phrases in the above passages indicate the interchangeability of “*sdom pa (stsal pa)*” and “*gnang ba*,” and may be translated as “(unless) a *saṅgha* gives permission.” Moreover, we can look at that rule preserved in Sanskrit in the Gilgit manuscripts as follows:

*yaḥ punar bhikṣur anuṣaṃpaññāya puḍgalāya duṣṭhulāpattim ārocayed
anyatra saṅghasaṃvṛtyā *pāyantikā /⁵⁴⁾*

This rule clearly demonstrates the equivalence of Skt. *saṃvṛti* = Tib. *sdom pa* = Tib. *gnang ba*. It may be possible, therefore, to say that Edgerton's interpretation of *saṃvṛti* as “consent” or “permission” is well supported by the Tibetan translation *gnang ba*. Given that Tib. *sdom pa* is used as a translation of Skt. *saṃvṛti* and is equivalent to Tib. *gnang ba*, which means “consent” or “permission,” we may want to reconsider the translation of *sdom pa* in *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* as “vow” or “ordination.”⁵⁵⁾ “Consent” or “permission” may be more accurate.⁵⁶⁾

§ 4 The importance of *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*

It seems acceptable that *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* should be interpreted as “consent” or “permission” given to a postulant who wishes to be fully ordained. I would like to consider the issue of whether such consent or permission is as important for female ordination as modern Tibetan Buddhists have assumed. Unfortunately, I have not found any substantial evidence in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. There is, however, a notable rule that may suggest that *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* should not be taken so seriously.

The Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* includes a rule regarding the giving of the *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, which is established as the 17-2nd *pāyantikā*-offense as follows:⁵⁷⁾

*yang dge slong ma gang gzhon nu ma lo nyi shu lon pa tshangs par
spyad pa nye bar gnas pa'i sdом pa ma gsol bar bsnyen par rdzogs par
byed na ltung byed do* //⁵⁸⁾

Regarding the verb *gsol ba* “to ask,” both the party who is asking for *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* and the party who is being asked may appear unclear. However, the narrative description of the event that caused the Buddha to establish this rule (i.e. the so-called “origin tale”) and the word-analysis following the rule in the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* suggest that a nun who is ordaining a postulant asks for *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*,⁵⁹⁾ and that the nun asks for it from the community.⁶⁰⁾ In fact, the phrase *ma gsol bar* “without asking” repeatedly appears in a few similar rules of the *pāyantikā*-offense where the verb “asking” signifies the action that a nun should take with the community.⁶¹⁾ Furthermore, there is another *vinaya*

text extant in Tibetan translation that may provide us with a better understanding of the rule. The text, the author of which is unknown, carries the Sanskrit title *Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-pratimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti* (Tib. *'Phags pa thams cad yod par smra ba'i rtsa ba'i dge slong ma'i so sor thar ba'i mdo'i 'grel pa*).⁶²⁾ It is known that though the title indicates that the text is a *vṛtti* “commentary,” and indeed it has been transmitted in Tibet not as *bKa' gyur* “the translation of the Buddha’s words” but as the *bsTan gyur* “the translation of scholarly works,” its content and style are like those of a canonical *vinaya* except for the beginning sections; that is, the text essentially consists of the rules and their origin tales.⁶³⁾ It is also already noted that in spite of the title, it is closely related not to the *Bhikṣuṇī-pratimokṣa* but rather to the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* preserved in Tibetan; that is, the rules — particularly, of the *pāyantikā*-offense — preserved in the *Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-pratimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti* generally match those found not in the *Bhikṣuṇī-pratimokṣa* but in the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* preserved in Tibetan.⁶⁴⁾ In regard to the rule in question, there is another version in the *Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-pratimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti* as the 118th *pāyantikā* as follows:

*phyis dge slong ma dag gis tshangs par spyod pa'i nye gnas kyi sdom pa ma byin par shes bzhin du bsnyen par rdzogs par byas pa las bcas / yang dge slong ma gang gzhon nur gyur ba lo nyi shu lon pa tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa ma byin par bsnyen par rdzogs par byed na ltung ba'o // dge slong ma tshangs par spyod pa'i nye gnas kyi sdom pa sngar ma byin par bsnyen par rdzogs par byed na ltung ba'o //*⁶⁵⁾

“At a later time, nuns intentionally ordained [women] without giving *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*. Because of [this event, the Buddha]

established [the rule, saying:] ‘If a nun ordains an unmarried woman who is over twenty without giving [her] *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, she (= the nun) comes to have a fault. [That is,] if a nun ordains [a woman] without previously giving [her] *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, she (= the nun) comes to have a fault.’”

When we compare this rule with the 17-2nd rule of the *pāyantikā*-offense of the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* that I quoted above, we can see that the phrase *ma gsol bar* “without asking for [*brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* of the *saṅgha*]” corresponds to the phrase (*sngar*) *ma byin par* “without (previously) giving [*brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* to the postulant],” and that both phrases signify the same irresponsible action taken by the nun who is to ordain a postulant. Taking everything into consideration, the rule I quoted from the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* may be translated as follows:

“If a nun ordains an unmarried woman who is over twenty without asking for *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* [of the *saṅgha*], she (= the nun) comes to have a fault.”⁽⁶⁶⁾

The validity of the ordination carried out without asking for *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* of the community is not referred to at all in the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga*, and therefore, it is not certain what would happen to the postulant in this situation.⁽⁶⁷⁾ It is certain, however, that the nun in this situation will have violated the 17-2nd rule of the *pāyantikā*-offense. This may become more significant if we take into consideration that the two *sdom pas* of nuns’ having pupils (*’khor gzhag pa’i sdom pa* and *’dod chen gyi ’khor ’jog pa’i sdom pa*) and the *sdom pa* of the two years’ learning of the Six Rules and Six Incidental Rules (*lo gnyis su chos drug dang rjes su mthun pa’i chos drug’i bslab pa’i sdom pa*) that I mentioned above are also

regulated in the 15-2nd, 16-2nd, and 15-4th rules of the *pāyantikā*-offense, respectively, in the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* in Tibetan. The 17-2nd rule of the *pāyantikā*-offense requires nuns to give *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* to a postulant prior to fully ordaining her. Likewise, the 15-2nd and the 16-2nd rules of the *pāyantikā*-offense require nuns to obtain **parṣadupasthāna-saṃvṛti* and **anala-(sic.)-parṣadupasthāna-saṃvṛti*, respectively, prior to having pupils, and the 15-4th rule of the *pāyantikā*-offense requires nuns to give *śikṣā-saṃvṛti* of the Six Rules and the Six Incidental Rules to a female novice (Skt. *śrāmaṇerikā*) prior to letting her start the two years' training as a female probationer (Skt. *śikṣamāṇā*). It is true that those who transgress these rules come to have an offense. However, it is merely *pāyantikā*-offense, which may be easily expiated with a simple confession, and carries no other penalty.⁶⁸⁾ In short, the failure to give **parṣadupasthāna-saṃvṛti*, **anala-(sic.)-parṣadupasthāna-saṃvṛti*, *śikṣā-saṃvṛti* of the Six Rules and the Six Incidental Rules, or *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* constitutes the same minor offense. This may suggest that *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* was regarded as no more significant than the other three, at least by the redactors of the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* extant in Tibetan translation.

Conclusion

In sum, I hope to have demonstrated the following five points in this paper:

- The context of ritual procedure of female ordination suggests that the giving of *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* signifies the female *saṅgha*'s approval of the postulant's fulfillment of the established requirements for becoming a nun.
- Tib. *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* is an attested

translation of Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*.

- All of the instances of *saṃvṛti* that Edgerton finds in *vinaya* texts and interprets as formal “consent” or “permission” are represented in Tibetan as *sdom pa*.
- Several other *sdom pas* appear in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that are given to a specific monk or nun through formal ecclesiastical acts and can be best understood as formal “consent” or “permission.”
- Tib. *sdom pa* as a translation of Skt. *saṃvṛti* occasionally appears to be interchangeable with Tib. *gnang ba* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, which explicitly supports Edgerton’s interpretation of *saṃvṛti*.
- There are rules that forbid the withholding of *sdom pas* (Skt. *saṃvṛtis*), including *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa’i sdom pa* (Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*), in the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, the transgression of which merely entails a *pāyantikā*-offense, i.e. a very minor offense.

Taking all of these points into consideration, it seems probable that “*sdom pa*” established in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in the sense of something given by the *saṅgha* through a formal ecclesiastical act is mostly a translation of Skt. *saṃvṛti*, and signifies a decision made by all the members of the *saṅgha* to give “consent” or “permission.” More importantly, it may also be concluded that *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa’i sdom pa* (Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*) is one such *sdom pa* (Skt. *saṃvṛti*) and signifies the female *saṅgha*’s consent that the postulant is physically eligible for full ordination.⁶⁹⁾ In short, it seems that a female probationer becomes a *bhikṣuṇī* candidate by receiving the consent.⁷⁰⁾ It is true that this consent is not trivial, since there seems to be no explicit reference to a valid female ordination carried out without *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa’i sdom pa* (Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*) in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.⁷¹⁾ But

given the other cases of *sdom pa* (Skt. *saṃvṛti*) regarding a crazy monk, an old or sick monk, a monk unworthy of reverence, and too lavish a householder, and the fact that the failure of giving the consent is prescribed as a very minor offense in the canonical *vinaya*, *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* might not be as significant as modern Tibetan Buddhists have thought.

There may be several good reasons why so much emphasis has been placed on *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* in the Tibetan Buddhist tradition.⁷²⁾ One of the most plausible reasons is that few, if any, Tibetan Buddhists have realized that *sdom pa* in *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* is a translation of Skt. *saṃvṛti*; instead, most have confused it with a translation of Skt. *saṃvara*. A popular Tibetan-Chinese dictionary, *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* (*zanghan dacidian* 藏漢大辭典), for example, gives this incorrect explanation of *sdom pa*.⁷³⁾ Modern scholars' translation of *sdom pa* in *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* as “vow,”⁷⁴⁾ which is a common translation of *saṃvara*,⁷⁵⁾ also highlights this confusion. It is well known that Skt. *saṃvara* (Tib. *sdom pa*) is a technical Buddhist concept related to ordination which is discussed at length in scholarly texts like the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣa*,⁷⁶⁾ and particularly emphasized in the Tibetan Tantric tradition.⁷⁷⁾ Since *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* — unlike other *sdom pas* (Skt. *saṃvṛtis*) — appears in the context of ordination, it may well be confused with a sort of *saṃvara*. That is to say, it seems probable that even though *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* is just one of the various *saṃvṛtis*, excessive importance has been attributed to it simply because the last word of its Tibetan rendering is *sdom pa*, which might lead one to incorrectly infer that the original Sanskrit behind it was *saṃvara*.⁷⁸⁾ This may also suggest that Tibetan translations of Indian Buddhist texts still admit several translational variations, even concerning technical Buddhist terms,⁷⁹⁾ and

some of these variations might appear, on a superficial level, so different from what we accept as “standard” that we might be misled about what Sanskrit is behind them, and thereby, misinterpret their significance.

Abbreviations

- 1) The *Vinaya* is a Buddhist canonical text and essentially consists of rules governing the monastic life regarding, for example, buildings, clothing, food, and rituals. The breaking of the rules mostly entails punishment. It is generally thought that Buddhist monastic communities were governed by the *Vinaya* just as most of our societies are by law. Therefore, the term “*vinaya*” is often glossed as Buddhist or monastic “law code.” See, for example, the entry “*vinaya*” in *Encyclopedia of Buddhism* (2004); Kieffer-Pülz (2007: 1-2).
- 2) Note, however, that there are many passages in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* that suggest continued validity of various ordinations that have been not carried out exactly according to the *vinaya* rules. See, among others, Clarke (2010).
- 3) The six *vinaya* texts are those of, alphabetically, the Dharmaguptakas, the Mahā-sāṃghikas, and the Mahīśāsakas, the so-called “Mūlasarvāstivādins,” the Sarvāstivādins, and the so-called “Theravādins.” For a brief overview of these six schools’ *vinaya* texts, see Clarke (2004: 77-78).
- 4) See, for convenience, S. Sasaki (1999: 47-51; 69-78) and the previous works cited there.
- 5) Hirakawa (1964: 513-520); S. Sasaki (1999: 208-211).
- 6) Sasaki Shizuka 佐々木閑 is one of the few modern *vinaya* researchers who have recognized the significance of the issue and discussed it in technical terms relatively early; S. Sasaki (2004). Later, the issue culminated in the international conference held in Hamburg in 2007: “First International Congress on Buddhist Women’s Role in Sangha: Bhikshuni Vinaya and Ordination Lineages.” A selection of the papers delivered at the conference have been published in 2010: *Dignity & Discipline: Reviving Full Ordination for Buddhist Nuns*. For overviews of the significant steps toward the (re-)establishment of the *Saṅgha* of nuns in the modern world, including the conference in 2007 and publication in 2010, see, among others, Hüsken and Kieffer-Pülz (2011); Schneider (2012).
- 7) As I will mention below, *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa’i sdom pa* is an attested translation of Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, and there are a few variations in its Tibetan translation, such as *tshangs par spyod pa la rim gror bya ba’i sdom pa* (the *Kṣudraka-vastu* Derge 6 Da 108a6) and *tshangs par spyod/spyad pa skyed pa’i*

sdom pa (n. 29 below). In this paper, “*tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*” — since it seems to be the most popular form — represents all of these Tibetan translations, collectively. For a discussion of the variant *skyed pa*, see n. 69 below.

- 8) It is true that, as Roth (1970: 30) points out, *vuṭṭhāna-sammūti* in the Pāli *Vinaya* and *upasthāpana-sammūti* in the Sanskrit *Bhikṣuṇī-vinaya* text attributed to the Lokottaravādins may be counterparts of *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*. Neither of the terms, however, are prefixed with *brahmacarya*. In a strict sense, therefore, *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* is not found in any other extant *vinaya* texts. See also n. 13.

- 9) Than (2007: 332, n. 6): 梵行近住律儀 (Tshangs par spyad [*sic.*] *pa nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*) が具体的にどのようなものであるのかはよく分からない。Note also that Than translated the technical concept in question into Japanese as “*bongyō gonjū ritsugi* 梵行近住律儀.” Here we see that Than used a technical translation “*ritsugi* 律儀,” which is an attested Chinese translation of Skt. *saṃvara*. This may suggest that Than thought *sdom pa* in *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* was a translation of Skt. *saṃvara*, though it is unclear on which source his translation is based. For further discussion of the confusion regarding the Sanskrit behind *sdom pa* in *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*, see Conclusion below.

- 10) As we will see in § 3, Petra Kieffer-Pülz is one of few modern scholars to note the technical concept. Apart from her, Nishimoto Ryūzan 西本龍山 also glosses the term *fanxing benfa* 梵行本法, which is, as we will see, a Chinese translation of *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, in his translation of Yijing's 義淨 *Kṣudraka-vastu*; Nishimoto (1935: 586, n. 53). He explains that it appears as *jingxing benfa* 淨行本法 in Yijing's **Ekottarakarmaśataka* and that it signifies the preliminary stages of the female ordination. His explanation is reasonable, but rather superficial. He also fails to refer to its Sanskrit or Tibetan form. Recently, Chung (2006: 11, n. 78) refers to the equivalence of Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* = Tib. *tshangs par spyad pa skyed pa'i sdom pa* = Chin. *jingxing benfa* 淨行本法.

- 11) Tsering (2010: 172-174). For the translation as “vow,” see also *Buddhist Ethics* (esp. p. 97 and n. 76); Finnegan (2009: 215); Schneider (2012: 129).

- 12) S. Sasaki (1999: 104). Hirakawa (1964: 518-519) notes that whether the second ceremony is performed by monks alone or by monks together with nuns is not explicitly referred to by all the six large *vinaya* texts but the *Shisong lü* 十誦律, which indicates that monks and nuns perform the second ceremony together. Although Hirakawa did not mention this, the Tibetan *Kṣudraka-vastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* also indicates so: the *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Derge, 5 *Da*, 111a2-113a6); cf. Kieffer-Pülz (2010: 218-219).

- 13) Tsering (2010: 172–179). Tsering’s translation might be derived, at least in part, from his interpretation of the Sanskrit word *upasthāna* as “ordination.” For the problem with this interpretation, see n. 69 below. Wei-chun (2007) provides a similar translation: “brahmacaryā basic ordination,” though her translation is based not on Tibetan but Yijing’s 義淨 *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Deleanu (2010: 3) also refers to female ordination as consisting of two ceremonies, and explains that “[the] preliminary part of the ordination is technically known in Sanskrit as the *brahmacaryopasthāna* or ‘ceremony [for achieving] pure conduct’ and is usually referred to in Chinese sources as 本法 (Ch. *benfa*; Jp. *honbō*) (literally, ‘root-factor’) or 本事 (*benshi*; *honji*) (literally, ‘root-fact’).” This explanation may require some revision. First, apart from the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, there seems to be no Sanskrit *vinaya* text in which the term *brahmacaryopasthāna* (-*saṃvṛti*) appears. Second, the term appears to signify not the ceremony itself, but rather the *saṃvṛti* that is granted to the postulant during the ceremony. Third, it is true that the terms *benfa* 本法 and *benshi* 本事 appear in the *Mishasai jiemo ben* 彌沙塞羯磨本 (T. 1424 [22] 219c) and the *Shisong lü* 十誦律 (T. 1435 [23] 295c, 296a4, 333a, 333b), respectively, but it is impossible to tell whether *benfa* 本法 and *benshi* 本事 are the exact counterparts of *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* because neither text is preserved in Sanskrit. Instead, Yijing’s translation as *fanxing benfa* 梵行本法 or *jingxing benfa* 淨行本法 (for the texts, see n. 29 and n. 30 below) suggests that the term *benfa* 本法 is a translation not of Skt. *brahmacarya-upasthāna* but *upasthāna-saṃvṛti*, since both *fanxing* 梵行 and *jingxing* 淨行 are attested translations of Skt. *brahmacarya* (see, for example, Bonwa s.v. *brahmacarya*), and Skt. *saṃvṛti* seems to be occasionally expressed as *fa* 法 in Yijing’s 義淨 translation (see n. 36 and n. 42 below). Likewise, Sujato (2012: 155) also explains the term *benfa* 本法 inaccurately. He asserts that it is a Chinese translation of Skt. *upasthāna*.
- 14) Schneider (2012: 128–129).
- 15) It is not entirely clear whether or not a *saṅgha* of Buddhist nuns has ever been established in Tibet. It seems that the consensus among modern scholars is that it has not. See, at least, Havnevik (1989: 45; 210, n. 37); Martin (2005: 67, n. 49; 72, n. 66); Heirman (2011: 612); Schneider (2012: 115).
- 16) It is well known that the famous Tibetan polymath Bu ston Rin chen ’grub (1290–1364 CE) doubted that the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* extant in Tibetan translation belonged to the tradition of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*; C. Vogel (1985: 110); Eimer (1986: 5); Schopen (1998: 178 n. 67). It seems that, although Bu ston Rin chen ’grub himself did not explicitly mention this, his doubt came from the fact that there are significant differences in wording, content, and sequence between the rules preserved in the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* and those preserved in the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa*.

sūtra, a set of provisions for nuns, of which the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* is supposed to be an analysis; Schopen (2008: 231). It is becoming clearer, however, that Bu-ston simply drew a possible conclusion without strong justification. In other words, it has become increasingly apparent that the situation regarding the entire corpus of texts for nuns of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is more complicated than Bu-ston might have thought. Schopen (2004: 180–181), for example, notes that a specific rule of the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa-sūtra* is unique in comparison to several other *vinaya* texts for nuns related to the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, including Yijing’s translations of the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* and the *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa-sūtra*, and suggests the possibility that it may be not the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga*, but the *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa* that does not belong to *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* tradition. In Schopen (2008: 230–232), an alternative idea is suggested as “more likely”: the variety of the rules for nuns may simply represent several different versions or redactions of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, which may signify different periods or developmental stages of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* tradition. Most recently, Clarke (2012a; 2012b) has further discussed this issue. He notes that the discrepancies of the rules for nuns within the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* fall into several patterns, and suggests that they be best explained by postulating the existence of multiple traditions of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*; cf. Emms (2012: 110–111); Borgland (2014: 20–21).

17) Hirakawa (1960: 576).

18) For Yijing’s 義淨 omission of the description regarding the ordination of monks, see Nishino (1966). He suggests that Yijing omitted the details of the rituals because they are already included in the **Ekottarakarmaśataka*, which Yijing had translated about ten years earlier than the *Pravrajyā-vastu*, and, therefore wanted to avoid repetition.

19) K. Sasaki (1971: 84); Schopen (1994: 63–64); Yonezawa (2001: 14).

20) Kishino (2013: 17–18).

21) Yamagiwa (1987: 27–28) notes that the formulae of male ordination preserved in the Tibetan *Pravrajyā-vastu*, the Chinese **Ekottarakarmaśataka*, and the Tibetan **Ekottarakarmaśataka* are very similar in content.

22) Note, however, the formula preserved in the Tibetan **Ekottarakarmaśataka* may be more polished than that found in the *Kṣudraka-vastu*. In the formulae of the *Kṣudraka-vastu*, for example, the preliminary inquiry of the postulant’s physical obstacles, which constitutes approximately fifty questions, includes the question of whether the postulant has already received *tshangs par spyod par nye bar gnas pa’i sdom pa* (Derge *Da* 109b2). As we will see immediately below, however, it should be given to her after the preliminary inquiry is complete, making this question unnecessary. In the formula of the Tibetan **Ekottarakarmaśataka*, on the other hand, the

preliminary inquiry does not contain this question.

- 23) Apart from the *Kṣudraka-vastu* and two **Ekottarakarmaśatakas*, the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* of the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* also includes a few formulae related to female ordination. More specifically — as we will see further details in §2 — the formula of giving *śikṣā-saṃvṛti* of the so-called Six Rules (Skt. *ṣaḍ-dharma*) and Six Incidental Rules (Skt. *ṣaḍ-anudharma*) appears once, and that of giving *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* appears twice. The two formulae of giving *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* found in the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* are almost identical. It is uncertain why the same formula is repeated in the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga*. Note also that the two same formulae are slightly different from those found in the Tibetan *Kṣudraka-vastu* and the Tibetan **Ekottarakarmaśataka* (n. 27 and n. 28 below). See also n. 66 below.
- 24) M. Schmidt (1994). The Sanskrit text was first edited by C.M. Ridding and L. de La Vallée Poussin in 1919 (“A Fragment of the Sanskrit Vinaya: *Bhikṣuṇīkarmavacanā*.” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* 1.3, 123–143.) — Edgerton referenced this first edition — and was re-edited by M. Schmidt in 1993; cf. Schopen (2010: 226). In this paper, I have used the second edition. For the text, see n. 32 below.
- 25) The *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* prescribes that female probationers (Skt. *śikṣamāṇās*) be trained in these twelve rules for two years. For content of the twelve rules, see Hirakawa (1982: 34, n. 17 [cf. Heirman 1997, 47, n. 77]; 1998: 556–557). For a comparative table of their Chinese, Sanskrit, and Tibetan wording, see Chung (2006: 8).
- 26) For the exact meaning of “taking formal possession,” see Kishino (2009).
- 27) The Nun-Who-Inquires-of-Postulant’s-Obstacles asks the female postulant a series of questions about her physical “obstacles” to becoming a nun, i.e. her physical conditions that would disqualify her for ordination. For each of the questions, see, for convenience, Wei-chun’s translation of Yijing’s 義淨 **Ekottarakarmaśataka*: Wei-chun (2007: 15–16).
- 28) I translate the Tib. *khyim na gnas pa* (Skt. *gr̥ha-uṣita*) and Tib. *lo bcu gnyis lon pa* (Skt. *dvādaśa-varṣa*) as “a married woman” and “twelve years old,” respectively, throughout this paper. These translations are, however, particularly tentative. The Skt. *gr̥ha-uṣita* is a counterpart of the Pāli *gihī-gatā*, and it remains controversial what kind of woman is referred to by *gihī-gatā*. See, among others, von Hinüber (2008: esp. 6–16); cf. Yijing’s 義淨 translation (the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga*, T. 1443, 1004c9; the *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa*, T. 1455, 514c6): “*cengjia-nü* 曾嫁女.” Hirakawa (1998: 564) asserts that *cengjia-nü* 曾嫁女 refers to the women who were married, especially widows. There seems to be also a still ongoing controversy over the reference to “twelve years” in the *vinaya* rules concerning the age limit for female ordination; that is, it seems to remain uncertain whether the phrase refers to years of age or the length

of marriage. See, Juo-Hsueh Shih (2000: 479-496); cf. Kieffer-Pülz (2005).

- 29) This is a literal translation of the *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Derge 6 *Da* 110b2-b5): *de nas gsol ba byos shig / gson cig 'phags ma'i dge 'dun ma rnams / ming 'di zhes bgyi ba 'di mkhan mo ming 'di zhes bgyi ba las bsnyen par rdzogs par 'tshal te / khyim na gnas pa lo bcu gnyis lon pa'am / gzhon nu ma lo nyi shu tshang la chos gos lnga dang lhung bzed du yang ldan / bar chad kyi chos rnams kyang yongs su gtsang ngo zhes bdag nyid mchi ste / ming 'di zhes bgyi ba 'di mkhan mo'i ming 'di zhes bgyi ste / 'phags ma'i dge 'dun ma rnams la tshangs par spyad pa skyed pa'i sdom pa gsol na / de ste 'phags ma'i dge 'dun ma rnams kyi dus la bab cing bzod na 'phags ma'i dge 'dun ma rnams kyi gnong la / 'phags ma'i dge 'dun ma rnams kyi ming 'di zhes bgyi ba la mkhan mo'i ming 'di zhes bgyi ste / de la tshangs par spyad pa skyed pa'i sdom pa stsol cig / mkhan mo'i ming 'di zhes bgyi ste / 'di ni gsol ba'o //*. Cf. Tibetan **Ekottarakarmaṣataka* (Derge 4118, 128b7-129a3): *dge 'dun 'phags ma rnams gsan du gsol / ming 'di zhes bgyi pa 'di mkhan mo ming 'di zhes bgyi bas dge 'dun las bsnyen par rdzogs par 'tshal te / ming 'di zhes bgyi ba 'di mkhan mo ming 'di zhes bgyi bas dge 'dun 'phags ma rnams las tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa gsol na / gal te dge 'dun 'phags ma rnams kyi dus la bab cing bzod na dge 'dun 'phags ma rnams kyi gnang bar mdzod cig dang / dge 'dun 'phags ma rnams kyi ming 'di zhes bgyi ba mkhan mo ming 'di zhes bgyi bas tshangs bar spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa gsol to // 'di ni gsol ba'o //*; Yijing's **Ekottarakarmaṣataka* (Taishō 1453, 462b11-18): “大德尼僧伽，聽！此某甲，從鄔波駄耶某甲，求受近圓。是女人，年滿二十。五衣鉢具。父母夫主，悉皆聽許（有無之事，如前問知）。苾芻尼僧伽，已與二年，學六法六隨法。此於二年，已學六法六隨法。某甲自言：‘遍淨無諸障法。’此某甲，今從苾芻尼僧伽，乞受淨行本法。某甲為鄔波駄耶，若苾芻尼僧伽，時至聽者，苾芻尼僧伽，應許。苾芻尼僧伽，今與某甲，受淨行本法。某甲為鄔波駄耶。”白如是。

- 30) Again, this is a literal translation of the *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Derge 6 *Da* 110b5-111a2): *las kyang 'di bzhin bya'o // gson cig 'phags ma'i dge 'dun ma rnams ... 'phags ma'i dge 'dun ma rnams las ming 'di zhes bgyi ste / mkhan mo ming 'di zhes bgyi ste / de la tshangs par spyad pa skyed pa'i sdom pa stsal bar gang la bzod pa de dag ni cang ma gsungs shig / gang la mi bzod pa de dag ni gsungs shig / 'phags ma'i dge 'dun ma rnams kyi ming 'di zhes bgyi ba la mkhan mo ming 'di zhes bgyi ste / de la tshangs par spyad pa skyed pa'i sdom pa stsal te / 'phags ma'i dge 'dun ma rnams kyi bzod cing gnang bas na cang mi gsung ste / de de bzhin du 'dzin to //*. Cf. Tibetan **Ekottarakarmaṣataka* (Derge 4118, 129a3-7): *las ni 'di ltar bya ste / dge 'dun 'phags ma rnams gsan du gsol / ... 'phags ma gang dag ming 'di zhes bgyi ba la mkhan mo ming 'di zhes bgyi bas tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa stsal bar bzod pa de dag ni cang ma gsung sig / gang dag mi bzod pa de dag ni gsungs shig / dge*

'dun 'phags ma rnams kyi bzod cing gnang nas / dge 'dun 'phags ma rnams kyi ming 'di zhes bgyi ba la / mkhan mo ming 'di zhes bas tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa stsal lags te / 'di ltar cang mi gsung bas de de bzhin tu 'dzin to //; Yijing's **Ekottarakarmaśataka* (Taishō 1453, 462b18–29): 次作羯磨: “大德尼僧伽, 聽! …若諸具壽, 聽與某甲, 受淨行本法, 某甲為鄔波跋耶者, 默然。若不許者, 說。苾芻尼僧伽, 已與某甲受淨行本法, 某甲為鄔波跋耶竟。苾芻尼僧伽, 已聽許由。其默然故, 我今如是持。”

- 31) Among others, the issue of whether the postulant has been completely trained in the Six Rules (Skt. *ṣaḍ-dharma*) and Six Incidental Rules (Skt. *ṣaḍ-anudharma*) for two years may primarily be associated with the giving of *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*, which issue is also included in the questions of the postulant's physical obstacles. For further details, see n. 66 below.
- 32) One of these sources is the *Vinayasūtra* by Guṇaprabha, which is a kind of digest version of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* in the form of *sūtras*. Another source is the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtti-abhidhāna-svavākyāna*, which is said to be one of the auto-commentaries of the *Vinayasūtra* by Guṇaprabha. Both texts are fully preserved in Tibetan and partially preserved in Sanskrit. (Note that recently, a complete 120 folio palm-leaf Sanskrit manuscript of the *Vinayasūtra* was found in the Potala. Dr. Luo Hong seems to be preparing a new edition of the *Vinayasūtra*. Unfortunately, none of the texts have been published yet. For the further details, see Luo [2007]). Therefore, by comparing Sanskrit texts with their Tibetan translations, the correspondence between Tibetan *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* and Sanskrit *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* may be confirmed: the *Vinayasūtra* (Tib. Derge 4117, 11 b2, 63a5; Skt. Taishō Univ., 1.571, 3.76); the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtti-abhidhāna-svavākyāna* (Derge 4119 *Zhu* 48a6–b1; P. V. Bapat and V. V. Gokhale, 52). Another source is the *Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācānā* manuscript from Nepal. It is known to include the descriptions of the ordination of nuns which are very similar to those preserved in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* of the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*; Roth (1970: 5, 102); cf. M. Schmidt (1994: 156–158); Chung (1998: 420–421). Since the descriptions comprise almost the same formula of the formal ecclesiastical act as I have cited above, the correspondence between Tibetan *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* and Sanskrit *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* can again be confirmed; M. Schmidt (1993: 255–256): *tato jñaptiḥ kartavyā / śṛnotv āryikāsaṃgha iyaṃ evaṃnāmikā evaṃn[āmi]/kāyā upādhyāyikāyā upasampatprekṣiṇī gr̥hoṣitā dvādaśavarṣā kumārikā vā paṇḍur̥ṇaṇaviṃśativarṣā paṇḍur̥ṇaṇam asyāḥ pancacivaraṇaṃ pātraṇ ca paṇḍur̥ṇaṇam āntarāyikair ddharmmair ātmānaṃ vadati seyaṃ evaṃnāmikā āryikāsaṃghā(dbra)hmacaryopasthānavṛtiṃ yācate / evaṃnāmikāyā upādhyāyikāyā saced āryikāsaṃghasya prāptakālaṃ kṣamate 'nujānīyād āryikāsaṃgho yad āryikāsaṃgha evaṃnāmikā(yā) brahmacaryopasthānasamvṛtiṃ dadyād*

*evannāmikayā upādhyāyikayety eṣā jnapitīḥ / evañ ca karmma karttavyaṃ / śṛnotv āryikāsaṃgha ... yāsām āryikāṇām kṣamate evnāmikāyā brahmacyopasthānasamvṛtiṃ dātum evannāmikayā upādhyāyikayā tas tūṣṇī yāsān na kṣamate tā bhā[ṣa]ntām / iyaṃ prathamā karmavācānā / evaṃ dvitīyā tṛtīyā karmavācānā vaktavyā / dattā āryi-kāsaṃghena evannāmikāyā brahmacyopasthānasamvṛtīr evannāmikayā upādhyāyikayā [kṣā]ntam anu[jnā]taṃ saṃghena yasmāt tūṣṇīm evam etad dhārayāmi / Frances Wilson translated this formula in Paul (1979: 91-92), based on the first edition of *Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācānā*. Wilson seems to have paid little attention to *saṃvṛti* in the *brahmacyopasthāna-samvṛti*, since she translated it as “observance of chastity.” It may also be noted that according to this formula in Sanskrit, the resolution involves three proclamations, unlike those prescribed in the *Kṣudraka-vastu* in Tibetan and the two **Ekottarakarmaśatakas* (n. 30 above).*

33) See also his *BHSG* (2.30).

34) Hirakawa (1995: 425-426).

35) The *Shisong lü* 十誦律 (T. 1435 [23] 131c23-132b29); cf. Simson (2000: 302, n. 2). The method of performing the formal act (*xuejia jiemo* 學家羯磨) is also described in detail there (132a11-18). In the word-analysis following the description of the formal act, “*xuejia* 學家” is explained as the devout householder who has attained the first **pratipāda* (132b23: 學家者, 得初道家), that is, the one who has set out for the sake of realizing the fruit of the Stream-winner (Skt. *srota-āpatti*); cf. Hirakawa (1995: 427).

36) See n. 32 above.

37) Cf. *Mvy.* (Sakaki: 8646); Clarke (2004: n. 96).

38) Derge 5, 80b4-81a6. Cf. Yijing’s 義淨 translation (T. 1443 [23] 931a20-b29): *bulijing fa* 不禮敬法.

39) The counterpart to *śaikṣa-samvṛti* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* appears as *śikṣā-samvṛti* in Sanskrit (Banerjee, 1977: 46-47; *GMNAI* vol. I, p. 248 [fol. 26r]), *bslab pa’i sdom pa* in Tibetan (Derge 3 *Nya* 232a2-5), and *xuejia-jiemo* 學家羯磨 in Yijing’s 義淨 Chinese translation (T. 1442 [23] 900b7-11). For the Tibetan and Chinese translations of *avadanārha-samvṛti*, see n. 38 above. The equivalence of Skt. *avadanārha-samvṛti* = Tib. *phyag bya ba’i ’os ma yin pa’i sdom pa* may be confirmed again in the *Vinayasūtra* (Derge 4117, 86a1 = Taishō Univ. 10.123).

40) The *Māṭṛkā* of the *Uttaragrantha* (Derge 7 *Pa* 239b7-240a1). The *Māṭṛkā* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* is not preserved in Yijing’s 義淨 translation. As Clarke (2004: esp. 102-113) notes, however, there are close parallels between the *Māṭṛkā* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* (Derge 7 *Pa* 233b4-310a6) and one section of the *Sapoduo-bu pinimodeleqie* 薩婆多部毘尼摩得勒伽 (T. 1441 [23] 593b21-605a4), in which *smyon pa’i sdom pa* is expressed as *kuangren jiemo* 狂人羯磨 (T. 1441 [23] 595b9-10).

- 41) The *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Derge 6 *Tha* 62a4–63a2, 63a2–63b7). Cf. Yijing’s 義淨 translation (T. 1451 [24]: 229c8–28; 229c29–230a5): *xuzhang jiemo* 畜杖羯磨; *sdom pa* of the net bag is not referred to with any specific title in Yijing’s translation (網絡... 廣如畜杖).
- 42) The *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Derge 6 *Da* 144a3–145a1). Cf. Yijing’s 義淨 translation (T. 1451 [24] 360b25–c24): *yuzi tongyishixiu jiemo* 與子同一室宿羯磨.
- 43) The *Nidāna* of the *Uttaragrantha* (Derge 7 *Pa* 131a5–132b1). Clarke (2014: 194, n. 117) briefly refers to this *sdom pa* and translates it as “permission to partake [of food, etc.] in union with relatives.” His translation of *sdom pa* as “permission” seems to be quite reasonable. Cf. Yijing’s 義淨 translation (T. 1452 [24] 432c14–433a10): *qingzu bianzuo wangxuan zhuzhi jiemo* 親族邊作往還止住羯磨.
- 44) The *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* (Derge 5, 280b4–281b4; 285a2–b6). Cf. Yijing’s 義淨 translation (T. 1443 [23] 1004a22–b27; 1005b10–c21): *xuzhong jiemo* 畜衆羯磨; *wuxian xuzhong fa* 無限畜衆法.
- 45) The *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* (Derge 5, 282a5–283b3; 287a6–288a2). Cf. the *Kṣudraka-vastu* (Derge 6 *Da* 107a4–108a4); Yijing’s *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* (1005b1–9): *zhengxue-fa* 正學法; *Viśeṣamitra’s *Vinaya-saṃgraha* (Tib. Derge 4105, 237b2 ≡ Chin. Taishō 1458, 596b6): *chos drug dang rjes su mthun pa’i chos drug la bslab pa’i sdom pa* ≡ 正學法. Negi (s.v. *sdom pa*) notes that this *sdom pa* appears as an attested equivalent for Skt. *saṃvṛti* in the *Vinayasūtra*: *sbyin pa ni bslab pa’i sdom pa zhes bya bas so* = *śikṣāsaṃvṛttir iti dānam* / (Derge 4117, 11b1–2 = Taishō Univ. 1.569). The *Vinayasūtra-vṛtty-abhidhāna-svayakhyāna* also allows us to attest that this *sdom pa* is a translation of Skt. *saṃvṛti* (Derge 4119 *Shu* 49a6.7 = P. V. Bapat & V. V. Gokhale, 52): Tib. *de’i ’og tu bslab pa brjod par bya’o zhes bya ba ni bslab pa’i sdom pa sbyin pa ’di’i rjes la bslab pa brjod par bya ba ni chos drug dang / rjes su mthun pa’i chos drug ste* / = Skt. “*anantaram asya śikṣōtkīrtanam*” *asya śikṣāsaṃvṛtidānasya anantaram śikṣāyāḥ utkīrtanam: śaṇṇāṃ dharmāṇāṃ, śaṇṇāṃ anudharmāṇāṃ* //. Here we see that the phrases “*bslab pa’i sdom pa (śikṣā-saṃvṛti)*” and “*chos drug dang rjes su mthun pa’i chos drug (*śaḍ-dharma-śaḍanudharma)*” appear separately, and do not combine into one long compound. This may suggest that the phrase “*bslab pa’i sdom pa (śikṣā-saṃvṛti)*” is a fixed compound and the phrase “*lo gnyis su chos drug dang rjes su mthun pa’i chos drug*” simply modifies that compound.
- 46) See, for example, *Mvy.* (Sakaki: 7010).
- 47) For the Sanskrit text, see immediately below; cf. n. 54.
- 48) Kieffer-Pülz (1992: esp. 366–371).
- 49) Hu-von Hintüber (1994: esp. 198–199).
- 50) See, for example, *smyon pa’i gñang ba* in the *Poṣadha-vastu* (Hu-von Hintüber, 1994: § 77.2 [not preserved in Skt.]; *smyos pa’i gñang pa* = **unmattaka-saṃvṛti* in the

Vinayasūtra (Derge 4117, 57a6, 82b1 = Taishō Univ., 2.2461, 9.51 [smyos pa'i gngang ba thob pas ni mi mthun pa nyid du mi 'gyur ro // = bhavati saṃvṛtair unmattakenāpy agratvam / ; smyos pa'i gngang ba phyag mi bya ba dang mi smra ba dang longs mi spyad pa dang gtsug lag khang gi sdom pa dag ni mngon sum du ma gyur par ro // = asaṃmukhibhūṭasya vihāro unmattakāvandanaṇālaṇāsaṃbhogasaṃvṛtayah /]); 'khor ba dang 'khor mang po nye bar gzhag pa'i gngang ba = parṣad-anala-(sic.)-parṣad-upasthāpana-saṃvṛti in the *Vinayasūtra* (Derge 4117 52a3; 82a2 = Taishō Univ., 2.2247; 9.27); *khar ba'i gngang ba = *daṇḍa-saṃvṛti in the *Vinayasūtra* (Derge 4117, 97 a7-b1 = Taishō Univ. 17.333 [gngang ba thob pas 'khar ba'o = labdhasaṃvṛtiḥ daṇḍām. /]). Note also that the permission given through a formal ecclesiastical act to a monk who wishes to leave during the rain's retreat is expressed as zhag bzhi bcu'i gngang ba in the Tibetan **Ekottarakarmaśataka* (Derge 4118, 216b3-217a3) and as zhag bzhi bcu'i sdom pa in the **Upāli-pariṣcchā* (Derge 7 Na 254b3).

- 51) For previous studies that note the existence of two *Uttaragranthas*, see Clarke (2001: n. 13). Apart from the studies referred to there, Matsumura (1996: n. 1) also notes relatively early that two *Uttaragranthas* have come down to us in Tibetan translation.
- 52) Kishino (2006: 384).
- 53) Cf. The *Vinaya-vibhaṅga* (Derge 3 Cha 265a2 = T. 1442 [23] 773b28-29): yang dge slong gang gang zag rdzogs par ma bsnyen pa la gnas ngan len gyi ltung ba brjod na dge 'dun gyis gngang ba ma gtogs te ltung byed do // = 若復苾芻，知他苾芻，有麁惡罪，向未近圓人說，除僧羯磨，波逸底迦。
- 54) *GMNAI* Vol. I, p. 242 [fol. 21v]. (*An indecipherable but clear curved-line appears on the top of the *akṣara* “pā” in the manuscript. Since there is a trace of erasure right above the *akṣara* “pā,” the curved-line seems to be a remnant of the erased *akṣaras* on the second line; cf. Banerjee (1977: 32): *pāyantikā*). This is the Sanskrit text that Kieffer-Pülz (1992) referred to as suggesting the equivalence of Skt. *saṃvṛti* = Tib. *sdom pa*; cf. n. 48 above.
- 55) The reference to the giving of *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* as “ordination” may be discredited in a technical sense. The *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* defines the attainment of female ordination as the completion of the resolution with three proclamations (Tib. Derge 5, 49a4; Chin. T. 1453 [23] 913c22-23; cf. Sujato 2012, 157 esp. n. 67), whereas the Tibetan *Kṣudraka-vastu* and both Tibetan and Chinese **Ekottarakarmaśatakas* establish the giving of *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* as accomplished by the resolution with a single proclamation; cf. Chung (2006: 6-7). Note, however, that the formula preserved in the *Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācānā* manuscript from Nepal prescribes that the resolution of giving *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* involve three proclamations. For the Sanskrit text, see n. 32 above.

- 56) Recently, Kieffer-Pülz (2010: n. 4) briefly referred to the *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*. She translated it as “the allowance (*saṃvṛti*) to enter the holy life,” and explained that “*brahmacaryopasthānasamvṛti* corresponds to the Theravāda tradition’s *vuṭṭhānasammuti*, ‘agreement as to ordination.’” (Almost the same translation and explanation are found in Hüsken & Kieffer-Pülz (2011: 261; 271, n. 44)). Her translation of *saṃvṛti* as “allowance” also makes sense.
- 57) The rules of the *pāyantikā*-offense are not numbered consecutively but divided into several groups in both Tibetan and Yijing’s 義淨 *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga*s. Each of the groups begins with a summary verse (Skt. *uddāna*). The numbering “17-2nd” provided here means the second rule of the 17th *uddāna* group. This 17-2nd rule does not appear in Yijing’s 義淨 version. It preserves, instead, the rule that concerns the Six Rules (Skt. *ṣaḍ-dharma*) and Six Incidental Rules (Skt. *ṣaḍ-anudharma*) and does not refer to *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* (T. 1443 [23] 1006c17-18): 若復苾芻尼, 知童女年滿二十, 不與二歲學六法六隨法, 即受近圓者, 波逸底迦. Sakurabe (1928: 208 [816]) notes the obvious differences in wording between the Tibetan and Yijing’s 義淨 Chinese versions of the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*, and suggests that the manuscripts used by Yijing were not identical to those used by Tibetan translators. The difference between the two rules that I mentioned here may be a good example of the discrepancy between the two versions of the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga*. It should also be noted that the rule I have quoted from the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* is not preserved in the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa*. This is also often the case with these two Tibetan texts. Schopen (2004: 180-181), for example, also notes that a rule included in the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* is not found in the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa* in his discussion about the significant variety among extant *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* texts for nuns.
- 58) Derge 5, 288b2-3. It might also be noted that the formula of formal ecclesiastical acts of giving *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* once again appears before the Buddha’s establishment of this rule (Derge 5, 288a4; cf. Than 2007: 333 [For his reference to the Peking Kanjur number “P. 1033” read “P. 1034.”]).
- 59) The *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* (Derge 5, 288b1-2): *de nas sbom dga’ mos tshangs par spyad pa nye bar gnas pa’i sdom pa ma gsol bar bsnyen par rdzogs par byed pa na ...* “Then, since Sthūlananda ordained [a woman] without asking for *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* [of the community] ...”
- 60) The *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* (Derge 5, 288b4): *ma gsol bar zhes bya ba ni dge ’dun las so //* “In regard to the phrase *ma gsol bar*, it is [asked] of the community.”
- 61) See, for example, the *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* (Derge 5, 281b1; 285b6; 290a6).
- 62) As Schopen (2008: 232) suggests, the compound “*sarvāstivādi-mūla* (Tib. *thams cad yod par smra ba’i rtsa ba*)” in the title may be interpreted in several ways. It should

be noted, however, that Tokuoka (1960: 65) pointed out that Tāranātha (1575–ca. 1635 CE), a famous Tibetan scholarly monk who visited India, used Tib. *gzhi* and *rtsa ba* to express school names in his *History of Buddhism in India*, and his usage of the two terms seems to be not arbitrary but rather systematic: while *gzhi* is used as a prefix, *rtsa ba* is used as a suffix, as in *dge 'dun phar chen pa'i sde pa rtsa ba* (**Mūla-mahā-sāṃghika*), *gnas brtan pa'i sde pa rtsa ba* (**Mūla-sthavira*), and *gnas ma'i sde pa rtsa ba* (**Mūla-vatsīputrīya*). Cf. Teramoto (1928: 363–364); Chimpa & Chattopadhyaya (1970: 339–340). This may suggest that Skt. *sarvāstivādi-mūla* (Tib. *thams cad yod par smra ba'i rtsa ba*) in the title is simply a variant of Skt. *mūla-sarvāstivāda* (Tib. *gzhi thams cad yod par smra ba*).

- 63) For a concise reference to the characteristics of the *Sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-pratimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti*, see Schopen (2004: 180–184); cf. Schopen (2008: 232).
- 64) Schopen (2008: 232–233); Clarke (2014: 225, n. 138). The close relationship between the *Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-pratimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti* and the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* may be highlighted by a series of approximately twenty rules of the *pāyantikā*-offense regarding female ordination that are commonly preserved in several *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* texts for nuns. See Appendix.
- 65) Derge 4112, 132b6–133a1.
- 66) This rule, unlike that of the *Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-pratimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti*, concerns only unmarried women who are over twenty, and does not refer to “married” women who are less than “twelve years old.” Therefore, it is unclear what happens in the case of them. It is true that the 15-4th rule of the *pāyantikā*-offense in the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* has similar wording and concerns only “married” women who are more than “twelve years old.” This rule, however, seems to forbid the withholding not of *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, but of *śikṣā-saṃvṛti* of the Six Rules and Six Incidental Rules. After all, the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* seems — very oddly — to make no mention of the case where “married” women who are more than “twelve years old” have been ordained without previously receiving the *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*. It might also be noted that before the Buddha established this rule, he mentioned how to give *śikṣā-saṃvṛti* of the Six Rules and Six Incidental Rules and *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, which once again includes the formulae of both formal ecclesiastical acts (Derge 5, 282b6–283b2; 283b3–284a6; cf. Than 2004: 333 [For “P. 1033” read “P. 1034.”]). Thus, we see that the same formula of giving *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* appears twice in total in the Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-vibhaṅga* (i.e. at 15-4th and 17-2nd rules of the *pāyantikā*-offense). These two same formulae, unlike those found in the Tibetan *Kṣudraka-vastu* and the Tibetan **Ekottarakarmaśataka*, concern only whether or not the postulant satisfies the requirement in regard to the Six Rules and Six Incidental Rules,

and do not refer to the other physical obstacles at all. In fact, before the Buddha taught these formulae, he indicated that the postulant who has been fully trained in the Six Rules and Six Incidental Rules for two years could receive the *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* (Derge 5, 288a2; 288b3). This may suggest that successfully completing the two years' training in the Six Rules and Six Incidental Rules is more important for postulants' receiving the *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* than any other physical obstacle.

67) Note that there is no explicit reference to the invalidity of an ordination that has been carried out without the giving of *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Rather, there is one question-and-answer between Upāli and the Buddha in the *Uttaragrantha* which may be interpreted as authorizing such an ordination. See n. 71 below.

68) Hirakawa (1998: 346).

69) It remains uncertain, at least to me, why this consent is titled “*brahmacarya-upasthāna*” and what it precisely means. Several earlier studies suggest that Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* is essentially the same as *vuṭṭhāna-saṃmuti* in the Pāli *Vinaya* (see n. 8 and n. 56 above). It seems that the term *vuṭṭhāna* in this Pāli compound may be interpreted as “ordination”; PTSD (s.v. *vuṭṭhāna*); Juo-Hsüeh Shih (2000: 389–390), or more flexibly as “sponsoring for ordination”; Norman (2001: 132). It is also known that in the context of the rituals of Jain texts, *uvaṭṭhāvaṇā-* (Skt. *upasthāpanā-*) can mean “ordination”; Sakamoto (2014: 342). It seems, however, that the term *upasthāna* in the Skt. compound *brahmacarya-upasthāna* does not mean “ordination” or “sponsoring for ordination,” since there is clearly a case-relation between *brahmacarya* and *upasthāna*, and *brahmacarya-upasthāna* seems to make little sense as a *tatpuruṣa* compound if we take the second element (*upasthāna*) to signify “ordination” or “sponsoring for ordination.” Monier-Williams (s.v. *upasthāna*), for example, gives “the act of placing one’s self near to; going near to (in order to worship), attendance” for *upasthāna*. If we read *upasthāna* in this sense, we may interpret *brahmacarya-upasthāna* as “being close to *brahmacarya*; attending to *brahmacarya*.” On the other hand, if we consider the Tibetan rendering *skyed pa* in *tshangs par spyod pa skyed pa* found in the Tibetan *Kṣudraka-vastu* as emphasizing the meaning of Skt. *upasthāna*, we may take *brahmacaryaupasthāna* to mean “generation/production/growth of *brahmacarya*,” according to, for example, Jäschke (s.v. *skyed pa*): “1. to generate, procreate, 2. to produce, form, cause, 3. to cause to germinate or grow.” In fact, the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtṭy-abhidhāna-svavyākhyāna* explains that the Tibetan *nye bar gnas pa* (Skt. *upasthāna*) is a synonym for Tib. *nye bar skye bar byed pa* (Skt. *upajanana*) (Derge 4119, 49b2–3 = P. V. Bapat & V. V. Gokhale, 52): *de la nye bar gnas pa ni nye bar skye* (Peking: *skyes*)

bar byed pa'o // = tasyopasthānaṃ upajananaṃ. A similar explanation is found in a commentary of the *Kṣudraka-vastu* extant only in Tibetan, *Śīlapālita's *Āgama-kṣudrakavyākhyāna* (Derge 4115, 136a6-7): *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa zhes bya ba la / ... de la nye bar gnas pa ni nye bar bskyed pa ste /*. Whether the Skt. *upasthāna* in *brahmacarya-upasthāna* simply means “being close to; attending to,” or is a synonym for *upajanana*, it is likely that the consent has something to do with *brahmacarya*, or celibacy. Given that a female probationer (Skt. *śikṣamāṇā*) receives *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* after she has completed the two years' training in the twelve rules specifically for them (i.e., Six Rules and Six Incidental Rules), the term *brahmacarya* in the title would sound reasonable if the rules established in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* regulated the female probationers' practice of *brahmacarya*, just like those in the Pāli *Vinaya*, the *Sifen lü* 四分律 (a *vinaya* text of the Dharmaguptakas), and the *Shisong lü* 十誦律 (a *vinaya* text of the Sarvāstivādins). Oddly enough, however, the Six Rules and Six Incidental Rules of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* do not include any regulation regarding *brahmacarya*: Hirakawa (1964: 506-510; 1998: 553-560). Therefore, the reason why the title of the consent includes the term “*brahmacarya*” is all the more unclear. It is possible, of course, that the term “*brahmacarya*” in the title is not derived from female probationers' training but simply indicates their practice as nuns. Even if the latter is the case, however, another difficult question may arise: why is the consent specific to female probationers named after *brahmacarya*, which should be conducted by Buddhist practitioners? It is also possible that the term “*brahmacarya*” does not mean “celibacy.” *Śīlapālita's *Āgama-kṣudrakavyākhyāna*, for example, explains that *brahmacarya* signifies “practice for the sake of *nirvāṇa*, i. e. ordination” (Derge 4115, 136a6-7): *tshangs pa ni mya ngan las 'das pa yin la / de'i don gyi spyod pa ni tshangs par spyod pa ste bsnyen par rdzogs pa yin no//*. (Same explanation is found in Bu ston's *Las brgya rtsa gcig gi nam par bshad pa cho ga'i gska la byed*, Fol. 111a [Serial no. 951] 3-4. For this text, see n. 78 below). This explanation may seem to make sense, since it enables us to interpret *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* as “the consent that the probationer is close to ordination.” The synonym *brahmacarya* for *upasamṇad(ā)* “ordination,” however, is not immediately confirmed in any other *vinaya* sources. Therefore, it remains uncertain why the term *brahmacarya* is used in the consent, instead of *upasamṇad(ā)*, a more common term for ordination. After all, it is unclear where the title *brahmacarya-upasthāna* comes from and what it refers to.

- 70) It should also be noted that the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* prescribes that when female novices (Skt. *śrāmaṇerikās*) start the two years of training in the Six Rules and Six Incidental Rules as female probationers (Skt. *śikṣamāṇās*), they should be given

śikṣā-saṃvṛti (Tib. *bslab pa'i sdom pa*) of the Six Rules and the Six Incidental Rules through a formal ecclesiastical act. Taking this into consideration, the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* seems to suggest that female novices become known as female probationers (Skt. *śikṣamāṇās*) by receiving *śikṣā-saṃvṛti* of the Six Rules and the Six Incidental Rules, and advance to candidacy for nuns (Skt. *bhikṣuṇīs*) by receiving *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*.

- 71) Note, however, that a question-and-answer between Upāli and the Buddha found in the so-called *Upāli-paripṛcchā* of the *Uttaragrantha* may suggest that the Buddha authorized such ordinations as valid (Derge 7 Na 240a2-3): *btsun pa dge slob ma dge slong gi las kyis bsnyen par rdzogs par bgyis na bsnyen par rdzogs pa zhes bgyi'am / u pa li bsnyen par rdzogs pa zhes bya ste / bsnyen par rdzogs par byed pa rnam ni 'das pa bcas pa'o* / “Reverend, if a female probationer (Skt. *śikṣamāṇā*) is fully ordained by monks’ formal ecclesiastical act, [should it be] deemed as full ordination?’ Upāli, it should be deemed as full ordination. Those who have ordained [her] come to have a fault.” Cf. Tsering (2010: 169). The phrase *dge slong gi las* “monks’ formal ecclesiastical act” seems to signify the ritual of male ordination. Given that male ordination does not require the giving of the *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* at all, this question-and-answer may be taken as indicating that the ordination of female probationers who have not been given *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* is valid, though the monks who ordained them become guilty. This may suggest that if only monks were brave enough to take risks — most likely low ones — in ordaining women, valid female ordination would be much easier and more common. In fact, there may have been such brave monks; Havnevik (1989: 210, n. 37): “Here (i.e. Acharya Tashi Tsering and Philippa Russell, “An Account of the Buddhist Ordination of Women,” *Chō-Yang* Vol. 1 no. 1) they maintain that there is evidence that from the twelfth century a few Tibetan lamas gave the *bhikṣuṇī* ordination to Tibetan nuns without the assistance of *bhikṣuṇīs*.” Clarke (2010: 235) also notes another, very similar question-and-answer found in the *Upāli-paripṛcchā* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* which suggests that nuns could be fully ordained without the presence of other nuns.

- 72) It is well known that the Tibetan Buddhist tradition has paid more attention to Guṇaprabha’s *Vinayasūtra* than to the canonical *vinaya* texts; Finnegan (2010: esp. 195, n 1; 196, n 3; 199). This might be another reason for the unreasonable significance given to *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa*, since the *Vinayasūtra* includes a *sūtra* that may read in such a way that emphasizes the significance of *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* (*brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*): Tib. (Derge 4117, 11b2): *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa ma thob par bsnyen par rdzogs par mi 'gyur ro //* = Skt. (Taishō Univ. 1.571): *nālabdhabrahmacaryopasthāna-*

saṃvṛter upasaṃpat / “For the one who has not obtained *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, there is no *upasaṃpad*.” The term *upasaṃpad(ā)* is often used in Buddhist texts as a technical term meaning “ordination,” and therefore, this *sūtra* may suggest that *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* is a requirement for full ordination. Note, however, that the interpretation of this *sūtra* seems to be open to further discussion. The comments on this *sūtra*, for example, found in the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtṭy-abhidhāna-svavyākhyāna*, said to be one of the auto-commentaries of the *Vinayasūtra* by Guṇaprabha himself, begin with this passage: Tib. (Derge 4119 Shu 49b2): *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa ma thob par bsnyen par rdzogs par mi 'gyur ro zhes bya ba la / 'dir bsnyen par rdzogs pa ni tshangs par spyod pa'o* // = Skt. (P. V. Bapat & V. V. Gokhale, 52): *na alabdhabrahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛteḥ upasaṃpad // upasaṃpad atra brahmacaryam*. “In regard to the *sūtra*: ‘For the one who has not obtained *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, there is no *upasaṃpad*,’ the term *upasaṃpad* here signifies *brahmacarya*.” Here we see that the commentary seems to interpret the term *upasaṃpad* as referring to *brahmacarya*. That is to say, the commentary may suggest that the term *upasaṃpad* is used in the *sūtra* not in the technical sense of “ordination,” but rather in a general sense of “attainment” (e.g., *BHSD* s.v. *upasaṃpad*): “In regard to the *sūtra*: ‘For the one who has not obtained *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti*, there is no attainment,’ the term ‘attainment’ there signifies [the attainment] of *brahmacarya*.” Note also that even if Guṇaprabha interpreted *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* to be as crucial for female ordination as Tibetan Buddhists thought, it might be merely his own interpretation. That is, it may be no more than an idea of a Buddhist scholar living in medieval India. There is no doubt that Guṇaprabha is a great *vinaya* master and his *Vinayasūtra* is a valuable digest version of the enormous canonical *vinaya* text. There is also no doubt, however, that the canonical *vinaya* texts are as important as secondary scholarly texts to understand the contents of the *vinaya* texts.

73) *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* (s.v. *tshangs spyod nyer gnas kyi sdom pa*): “*dge slong ma'i sdom pa dngos ma blangs sngon la 'bog pa'i sdom pa zhig ste / dge slob ma'i sdom pa dang rdzas rigs gcig pa bar ma'i tshul khrims so*. 淨行近住戒。未正受比丘尼戒前所受之戒律，即与正学女戒同体之中間戒。” Cf. Tsedroen & Anālayo (2013: 757–758, n. 50). The source on which this explanation is based is uncertain, since, as Schopen (2010: 228) notes, this dictionary does not cite its sources or give references for its entries.

74) See n. 11 above.

75) See, for example, *BHSD* (s.v. *saṃvara*).

76) For the discussion of *saṃvara* found in the *Abhidharmakośabhāṣa*, see, recently, Hakamaya (2011), with much caution regarding his explanation of the *Nidāna* and

the *Muktaka* of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Although it may be expected that *saṃvara* would also be discussed in detail in canonical *vinaya* texts, such discussion — or even the term *saṃvara* itself or its Tibetan/Chinese equivalent (*sdom pa*/律儀) — is uncommon. In the *Pravrajyā-vastu* “Chapter on entering the religious life” of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* extant in Tibetan, for example, only two *-saṃvara* compounds appear merely four times in total: *dge bsnyen gyi sdom pa* (Derge 1 *Ka* 49a3; 49a6; 72 b3) and *dge tshul gyi sdom pa* (Derge 1 *Ka* 51a5), both of which are attested in the *Vinayasūtra-vṛtyi-abhidhāna-svavyākhyāna* (P. V. Bapat and V. V. Gokhale, 6; 5) as Skt. *upāsaka-saṃvara* and *śrāmaṇera-saṃvara*, respectively.

77) For the significance of *sdom pa* (Skt. *saṃvara*) in the Tibetan Tantric tradition, see, at least, Sobisch (2002: esp. 9–19). Note that Sobisch also translates Tib. *sdom pa* as “vow.”

78) Note that Bu ston Rin chen 'grub (1290–1364 CE) might have made that incorrect inference. In his *Las brgya rtsa gcig gi rnam par bshad pa cho ga'i gsal la byed*, which is, according to Tohoku Catalogue (No. 5187), “a commentary on the **Ekottara-karmaśataka* by Guṇaprabha,” he mentions several Skt. *saṃvṛtis* including Skt. *brahmacaryopasthāna-s.* that are found in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. He refers to *saṃvṛti* in *brahmacaryopasthāna-s.* as Tib. *sdom pa*, while referring to the other *saṃvṛtis* as Tib. *gnang ba*: ... *yul dbus su dge slong ma'i sdom pa sbyin pa dang / tshangs spyod la nyer gnas kyi **sdom pa** sbyin pa dang / 'khor dang 'khor mang po 'jog pa'i **gnang ba** sbyin pa la dge slong ma bcu gnyis su tshang ba dang ...* (fol. 4b4–5); ... *nad pa la snam sbyar dang mi 'bral ba'i gnang / lo drug ma lon par stan byed pa'i gnang ba sbyin pa dang / dge slong ma la 'khor dang 'khor mang po 'jog pa'i **gnang ba** sbyin pa gnyis dang / 'khor ba'i **gnang ba** dang dra ba'i **gnang ba** dang / de gnyis ka'i tshig gcig gis sbyin pa dang / dge slong ma bu dang lhan cig khyim gcig tu nyal ba'i **gnang ba** sbyin pa dang / mu ge'i tshe dge slong ma nye du dang lhan cig 'dres pa'i **gnang ba** byin pa dang / dbyar nang du mtshams kyi phyi rol du 'gro ba la zhag bzhi bcu'i gnang ba sbyin pa dang /* (fol. 10a7–b1). Here we see that Bu-ston refers to all *saṃvṛtis* but *brahmacaryopasthāna-s.* as *gnang ba*, though they are, as we already saw above, expressed as *sdom pas* in the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. There is a passage, moreover, that may imply that Bu-ston thought *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* for a sort of *saṃvara*: ... *sbyin pa'i las / mi mthun pa'i las gnyis kyi dang po la / dge tshul la bsnyen rdzogs kyi sdom pa sbyin pa dang / dge tshul ma la bslab pa'i sdom pa sbyin pa dang / dge slob ma la tshangs spyod la nyer gnas kyi sdom pa dang / de la dge slong ma'i bsnyen par rdzogs pa'i sdom pa sbyin pa dang / ...* (fol. 16a1.3). Here we see that *brahmacaryopasthāna-saṃvṛti* as well as *śiṣṭā-saṃvṛti* of the Six Rule and the Six Incidental Rules is referred to along with the

so-called “*bhikṣu-saṃvara*” and “*bhikṣuṇī-saṃvara*.” These passages may suggest that Bu-ston distinguished Tib. *sdom pa* (Skt. *saṃvara*) from Tib. *gnang ba* (Skt. *saṃvṛti*), and regarded *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* as a sort of *saṃvara*. If this is the case, it may be possible that the misinterpretation of Tib. *sdom pa* in the *tshangs par spyod pa la nye bar gnas pa'i sdom pa* as a translation of Skt. *saṃvara* traces back to the 13th/14th century CE at the latest.

- 79) In fact, such translational variations are not rare, at least in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*. Schopen (2004: 162–168), for example, notes that the well-known technical Buddhist phrase *dakṣiṇām ādāś* (“directing the reward of one’s gift”), for which a typical Tibetan translation might be *yon bshad pa*, is sometimes translated as *sbyin pa'i yon bsngo* and *sbyin rabs bsgrag pa* in the Tibetan *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.

Appendix: A series of *pāyantikā*-offenses of female ordination in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya* texts for nuns

Topic	Chin. BP & BV (T.1455 & T.1443)	Tib. BP (D 4)	Tib. BV (D 5)	BPSV (D 4112)
Ordination by those who have been nuns for less than 12 years	no. 11-6 (514 c 2—) & no. 106 (1004 a 10—)	*no. 73 (18 b 6)	no. 15-1 (280 a 5—)	no. 108 (130 b 6—)
To take a pupil without * <i>parśadupasthāna-saṃvṛti</i>	no. 11-7 (514 c 3—) & no. 107 (1004 a 22—)	*no. 74 (18 b 6—)	no. 15-2 (280 b 4—)	no. 109 (131 a 3—)
To ordain a “married” woman who is under “12 years old”	no. 11-8 (514 c 5—) & no. 108 (1004 b 29—)	*no. 76 (18 b 7—)	no. 15-3 (281 b 4—)	no. 110 (131 a 6—)
To ordain a “married” woman who is over “12 years old” without <i>śikṣā-saṃvṛti</i> of the 12 Rules	no. 11-9 (514 c 6—) & no. 109 (1005 b 1—)	*no. 78 (19 a 1)	no. 15-4 (282 a 5—)	no. 111 (131 b 1—)
To pay little attention to many pupils	—	—	no. 16-1 (284 b 5—)	—
To take many pupils without * <i>anala-(sic)—parśadupasthāna-saṃvṛti</i>	no. 11-10 (514 c 8—) & no. 110 (1005 b 10—)	*no. 75 (18 b 7)	no. 16-2 (285 a 2—)	no. 112 (131 b 5—)
To initiate an emotionally disturbed woman	—	*no. 86 (19 a 6)	—	—
To initiate a pregnant woman	no. 12-1 (514 c 12—) & no. 111 (1005 c 25—)	*no. 87 (19 a 7)	no. 16-3 (286 a 1—)	no. 113 (132 a 1—)
Not to give pupils instructions	no. 12-2 (514 c 14—) & no. 112 (1006 a 6—)	*no. 92 (19 b 1—)	no. 16-4 (286 a 5—)	no. 114 (132 a 2—)
Not to provide pupils with necessities	—	*no. 90 (19 a 7—)	no. 16-5 (286 b 1—)	no. 115 (132 a 5—)
Not to give pupils shelter in a nunnery	no. 12-3 (514 c 14—) & no. 113 (1006 a 20—)	—	—	—
Not to lead an ordained woman to escape from her husband’s pursuit	no. 12-4 (514 c 16—) & no. 114 (1006 b 4—)	*no. 91 (19 b 1)	no. 16-6 (286 b 4—)	no. 116 (132 a 6—)
To ordain an unmarried woman under 20	no. 12-5 (514 c 17—) & 115 (1006 b 26—)	*no. 77 (19 a 1)	no. 17-1 (287 a 3—)	no. 117 (132 b 1—)
To ordain an unmarried woman under 20 without <i>śikṣā-saṃvṛti</i> of the 12 Rules	no. 12-6 (514 c 19—) & no. 116 (1006 c 11—)	*no. 79 (19 a 2—)	—	—
To ordain an unmarried woman under 20 without <i>brahmacāryopasthāna-saṃvṛti</i>	—	—	no. 17-2 (287 a 6—)	no. 118 (132 b 4—)
To initiate a quarrelsome woman	no. 12-7 (514 c 21—) & no. 117 (1006 c 21—)	*no. 89 (19 a 7)	no. 17-3 (288 b 6—)	no. 119 (133 a 1—)
To initiate a woman afflicted by sorrow	no. 12-8 (514 c 22—) & no. 118 (1007 a 15—)	*no. 88 (19 a 7)	no. 17-4 (289 b 3—)	no. 120 (133 a 6—)
To ordain a probationer who has not completed the training of 2 years in the 12 Rules	no. 12-9 (514 c 24—) & no. 119 (1007 b 1—)	*no. 80 (19 a 3)	no. 17-5 (290 a 1—)	no. 121 (133 b 1—)
Not to ordain a probationer who has completed the training of 2 years in the 12 Rules	no. 12-10 (514 c 25—) & no. 120 (1007 b 13—)	*no. 81 (19 a 3—)	no. 18-1 (290 b 7—)	no. 122 (133 b 6—)
To ordain a woman who has not obtained approval of her husband	no. 13-1 (515 a 1—) & no. 121 (1007 b 29—)	*no. 85 (19 a 6)	no. 18-2 (291 a 3—)	no. 123 (134 a 2—)
To offer a woman ordination for cloth	no. 13-2 (515 a 3—) & no. 122 (1007 c 20—)	*no. 82 (19 a 4)	no. 18-3 (291 b 3—)	no. 124 (134 a 6—)
To talk a woman into giving up her business with a promise to ordain her, and to break it	no. 13-3 (515 a 1—) & no. 123 (1008 a 05—)	*no. 83 (19 a 5—)	no. 18-4 (292 a 1—)	no. 125 (134 a 7—)
To take a pupil every year	no. 13-4 (515 a 6—) & no. 124 (1008 a 29—)	*no. 84 (19 a 6)	no. 19-1 (292 a 7—)	no. 126 (134 b 3—)
To initiate a prostitute	no. 16-10 (515 b 27—) & no. 160 (1014 a 08—)	—	no. 25-2 (306 b 6—)	no. 161 (142 a 1—)

*The Tibetan *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa* does not number its rules. The numbering provided here follows Clarke (2012b: 21, table 4). BP = *Bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa*, BV = *Bhikṣuṇī-Vibhaṅga*, BPSV = *Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-pratimokṣa-sūtra-vṛtti*.

Abbreviations

- BHSD** *Franklin Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*. (Volume II Dictionary). Reprint, Kyoto: Rinsen Co. 臨川書店, 1985.
- BHSG** *Franklin Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary and Grammar* (Volume I Grammar). Reprint, Kyoto: Rinsen Co. 臨川書店, 1985.
- Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo** Zhang Yisun 張怡蓀 et al. *Bod rgya tshig mdzod chen mo* (*zanghan dacidian* 藏漢大辭典). Beijing: *Minzu chubanshe* 民族出版社, 1985.
- Bonwa** *Kan'yakutaishō bonwa daijiten* (*Zōho kaitei ban*) 漢訳対照梵和大辞典(増補改訂版). Edited by Wogihara Unrai 荻原雲来 (Seen through the press by Tsuji Naoshirō 辻直四郎). Tokyo: Suzuki gakujyutsu zaidan 鈴木学術財団, 1979.
- Buddhist Ethics** Jamgön Kongtrul Lodrö Tayê, *Buddhist Ethics* (The Treasury of Knowledge: Book Five: Buddhist Ethics). Trans. by the Kalu Rinpoche Translation Group, under the direction of Ven. Bokar Rinpoche. New York: Snow Lion Publications, 2003.
- Derge (or D)** *Bka' 'gyur sde dge'i par ma. Derge Kanjur: Bka' 'gyur (sde dge) (post par phud print)* (CD-ROM edition. 103 vols). New York: Tibetan Buddhist Resource Center, 2003-4.
- Dignity & Discipline** *Dignity & Discipline: Reviving Full Ordination for Buddhist Nuns*. Edited by Thea Mohr and Jampa Tsedroen. Boston: Wisdom Publications. 2010.
- Encyclopedia of Buddhism** *Encyclopedia of Buddhism*. Robert E. Buswell, Jr. et al. 2 Vols. New York: Macmillan Reference, 2004.
- GMNAI** *Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India: Facsimile Edition*. Volume I. Vinaya Texts. Edited by Shayne Clarke. Tokyo: The National Archives of India and the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University, 2014.
- Las brgya rtsa gcig gi rnam par bshad pa cho ga'i gsal la byed** The Collected Works of Bu-Ston, Part 21 (Zha), serial nos. 731-978. Edited by L. Chandra. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1971.
- Monier-Williams** M. Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary: Etymologically and Philologically Arranged with special reference to Cognate Indo-European Languages*. (New Edition). Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.
- Mvy. (Sakaki)** Sakaki (Ryōzaburō) 榊亮三郎 ed., *Mahāvīyutpatti: Bon-zō-kan-wa shiyaku taikō hon'yaku myōgi taishū (bon-zō sakuin)* 梵藏漢和四譯對校翻訳名義大集(梵・藏索引). 2 vols. (Reprint). Kyoto: Rinsen Co. 臨川書店, 1998.
- Negi** J. S. Negi, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary*. Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1993.
- Peking** *Eiin Peking ban Chibetto daizokyō: Ōtani daigaku toshokan zō* 影印北京版 西藏大

藏經: 大谷大学図書館蔵. Tokyo: Chibetto daizokyo kenkyukai 西藏大藏經研究会, 1955-1961.

PTSD *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*. Edited by T.W. Rhys Davids and William Stede. (Reprint). London: Pali Text Society, 1979.

Taishō (or T.) *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. Edited by Takakusu Junjirō 高楠順次郎, and Watanabe Kaikyoku 渡邊海旭. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō issaikyō kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, 1924-1935.

Tohoku Catalogue *A Catalogue of the Tohoku University Collection of Tibetan Works on Buddhism*. Sendai: Tohoku University, 1953.

Vinayasūtra (Taishō Univ.) The Digital Data of Preliminary Transliteration of the Vinayasutra. (The original Manuscript of VS is reproduced in the Facsimile Edition of a Collection of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Manuscripts in Tibetan dBu-med Script, published by the Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University, in 2001). From http://www.tais.ac.jp/related/labo/sobutsu/sobutsu_book/data/vinayasutra_trlt.pdf

Vinayasūtra-vṛtti-abhidhāna-svavyākhyāna-nāma (P. V. Bapat & V. V. Gokhale) P.V. Bapat and V.V.Gokhale eds., *Vinaya-Sūtra and Auto-Commentary on the Same by Guṇaṇḍya*. (Chapter I - Pravrajyā-vastu). Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute, 1982.

Bibliography

Banerjee (Anukul Chandra), 1977: *Two Buddhist Vinaya Texts in Sanskrit: Prātimokṣa-sūtra and Bhikṣukarmavākyā*. Calcutta: The World Press Private Limited.

Bhikkhu-Bodhi, 2010: “The Revival of Bhikkhuni ordination in the Theravāda Tradition.” In: *Dignity & Discipline*, 99-142.

Borgland (Jens Wilhelm), 2014: “A Study of the Adhikaraṇavastu: Legal Settlement Procedures of the Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.” Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oslo.

Chimpa (Lama) & Chattopadhyaya (Alaka), 1970: *Tāranātha's History of Buddhism in India*. Translated from the Tibetan by Lama Chimpa, Alaka Chattopadhyaya; edited by Debiprasad Chattopadhyaya. Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.

Chung (Jin-il), 1998: ““Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācanā” of the Mūlasarvāstivādins.” In: *Facets of Indian Culture : Gustav Roth Felicitation Volume, Published on the Occasion of his 82nd Birthday*. (Chief editor, Chitta Ranjan Prasad Sinha; Editors, Kameshwar Prasad, Jagdishwar Pandey, Umesh Chandra Dwivedi; Associate editor, Rajendra Prasad). Patna: Bihar Puravid Parishad, 420-423.

—, 2006: “Ursprung und Wandel der Aufnahme von Frauen in den buddhistischen Orden nach der kanonischen Überlieferung: eine Randbemerkung.” *Sanko Bunka*

Kenkyusho Nenpo 三康文化研究年報. Vol. 28, 1-15.

Clarke (Shayne) 2001: “The *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya Mukṭaka* 根本説一切有部目得迦,” *Bukkyō kenkyū* 佛教研究 30, 81-107.

—, 2002: “The *Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya*: A Brief Reconnaissance Report.” In: *Sakurabe Hajime hakushi kiju kinenronsh ū: shoki bukkyō kara abidaruma e* 櫻部建博士喜寿記念論集・初期仏教からアビダルマへ. Kyoto: Heirakuji shoten 平楽寺書店, 45-63.

—, 2004: “*Vinaya Māṭṛkā* — Mother of the Monastic Codes, or Just Another Set of Lists? A Response to Frauwallner’s Handling of the Mahāsāṃghika Vinaya,” *Indo-Iranian Journal* 47 (2), 77-120.

—, 2010: “Creating Nuns Out of Thin Air: Problems and Possible Solutions concerning the Ordination of Nuns according to the Tibetan Monastic Code.” In: *Dignity & Discipline*, 227-238.

—, 2012a: “Multiple *Mūlasarvāstivādin* Monasticisms: On the Affiliation of the Tibetan Nuns’ Lineages and Beyond.” Paper delivered at Oslo Buddhist Studies Forum, June 12, 2012.

—, 2012b: “On the Problems Surrounding the Bhikṣuṇī Prātimokṣa Traditions Preserved in Tibetan: Pelliot tibétain 891 and 892 (**Ārya-sarvāstivādi-mūla-bhikṣuṇī-prātimokṣa-sūtra*).” Paper delivered at Institute for Advanced Studies on Asia, University of Tokyo, October 29, 2012.

—, 2014: *Family Matters in Indian Buddhist Monasticisms*. Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press.

Deleanu (Florin), 2010: “Transmission and Creation: Ordinations for Nuns in Ancient and Early Mediaeval Japan,” *International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies* 14, 1-99.

Eimer (Helmut), 1986: “Chibetto daizōkyō kanjyuru no kairitsubu ni okeru tekisuto no hairesujyunjo 西藏大蔵経甘殊爾の戒律部におけるテキストの配列順序.” (Trans. by Okada Hiroyuki 岡田行弘). *Bukkyō gaku* 佛教学 20, 1-10.

Emms (Christopher), 2012: “Evidence for Two *Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya* Traditions in the Gilgit *Prātimokṣa-Sūtras*.” MA thesis, McMaster University.

Finnegan (Damcho Diana), 2009: “For the Sake of Women, too: Ethics and Gender in the Narratives of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.” Ph.D. dissertation. University of Wisconsin-Madison.

—, 2010: “A “Flawless” Ordination: Some Narratives of Nuns’ Ordinations in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya*.” In: *Dignity & Discipline*, 195-206.

Hakamaya (Noriaki) 袴谷憲昭, 2011: “Jusshu no upasampad(ā) to kaitai no mondai 10種の upasampad(ā) と戒体の問題,” *Komazawadagaku bukkyōgakubu kenkyū kiyō* 駒澤大學佛教學部研究紀要 69, 1-45.

- Havnevik (Hanna) 1989: *Tibetan Buddhist Nuns: History, Cultural Norms and Social Reality*. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Heirman (Ann) 2011: “Buddhist Nuns: Between Past and Present.” *Numen* 58, 603–631.
- von Hinüber (Oskar), 2008: “The Foundation of the Bhikkhunīsaṃgha: A Contribution to the Earliest History of Buddhism.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* Vol. XI, 3–29.
- Hirakawa (Akira) 平川彰, 1960: *Ritsuzō no kenkyū* 律蔵の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- , 1964: *Genshi bukkyō no kenkyū* 原始仏教の研究. Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- , 1982: *Monastic Discipline for the Buddhist Nuns: An English Translation of the Chinese Text of the Mahāsāṅghika-Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*. (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, 21). Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.
- , 1995: *Nihyaku gojukkai no kenkyū* 二百五十戒の研究 IV. (Hirakawa Akira chosakushū 平川彰著作集, 17). Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- , 1998: *Bikuni ritsu no kenkyū* 比丘尼律の研究. (Hirakawa Akira chosakushū 平川彰著作集, 13). Tokyo: Shunjūsha 春秋社.
- Hüsken (Ute) & Kieffer-Pülz (Petra), 2011: “Buddhist Ordination as Initiation Ritual and Legal Procedure.” In: *Negotiating Rites* (Oxford Ritual Studies Series). New York: Oxford University Press, 255–276.
- Hu-von Hinüber (Haiyan), 1994: *Das Poṣadhavastu* (StII Monographien, 13). Reinbek: Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen.
- Juo-Hsüeh Shih (Bhikkhuni), 2000: *Controversies over Buddhist Nuns*. Oxford: The Pali Text Society.
- Kieffer-Pülz (Petra), 1992: *Die Śīmā: Vorschriften zur Regelung der buddhistischen Gemeindegrenze in älteren buddhistischen Texten*. (Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie 8). Berlin: Franz Steiner.
- , 2005: “Ehe- oder Lebensjahre?: Die Altersangabe für eine ‘verheiratete’ Frau (*gihigatā*) in den Rechtstexten der Theravādin.” *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 155, 199–238.
- , 2007: “Stretching the Vinaya Rules and Getting Away with It: Eleventh I.B. Horner Memorial Lecture, 2005.” *The Journal of the Pali Text Society*, Vol. XXIX, 1–49.
- , 2010: “Presuppositions for a Valid Ordination with Respect to the Restoration of the Bhikṣuṇī Ordination in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Tradition.” In: *Dignity & Discipline*, 217–225.
- Kishino (Ryōji) 岸野亮示, 2006: “Futatsu no ‘Uttaraguranta’ (‘Upāri mondō’ no kōsatsu) 二つの『ウッタラグラント』(「ウパーリ問答」の考察),” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學仏教學研究55-1, 385–382.
- , 2009: “Koromo ya hachi no adhi-*śthā*- 衣や鉢のadhi-*śthā*,” *Nihon bukkyōgakkai*

nenpō 日本仏教学会年報 74, 181-204.

——, 2013: “A Study of the *Nidāna*: An Underrated Canonical Text of the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.” Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA.

Luo (Hong), 2007: “The Recensions of Guṇaprabha’s *Vinayasūtra*: Towards an Editorial Policy for the Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Text.” *Rivista del Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici e del Dipartimento di Studi e Ricerche su Africa e Paesi Arabi* 67, 1-16.

Martin (Dan), 2005: “The Woman Illusion? Research into the lives of spiritually accomplished women leaders of the 11th and 12th centuries.” In: *Women in Tibet*. Edited by Janet Gyatso and Hanna Havnevik. London: Hurst & Company, 49-82.

Matsumura (Hisashi) 松村恒, 1996: “The *Kāthinavastu* from the *Vinayavastu* of the *Mūlasarvāstivādins*.” In: *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen* III (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden • Beiheft 6). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 145-239.

Nishino (Hideyo) 西野英世, 1966: “Konponuburitsu no jugusokukaihō ni tsuite 根本有部律の受具足戒法について” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 15-1, 188-189.

Nishimoto (Ryūzan) 西本龍山, 1935: *Kokuyaku issaikyō: ritsubu* (25) 国訳一切經・律部二十五, Tokyo: Daitō shuppansha 大東出版社.

Norman, (K. R.), 2001: “*Vuṭṭhāpeti, vuṭṭhāna* and related matter.” *Indologica Taurinensia*, vol. 27, 121-137.

Paul (Diana Y.), 1979: *Women in Buddhism: Images of the Feminine in Mahāyāna Tradition*. With Contribution by Frances Wilson. Foreword by I. B. Horner. (Berkeley: Asian Humanities Press).

Roth (Gustav), 1970: *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya: Including Bhikṣuṇī-prakīrṇaka and a summary of the bhikṣu-prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*. Edited and Annotated for the first time with *Introduction* and two *Indexes*. (Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series, 12). Patna: Kashi Prasad Jayaswal Research Institute.

Sakamoto (Junko) 阪本純子, 2014: “Shukke to kami・hige no jyokyo: Jaina kyō to bukkyō tonō taihi” 出家と髪・鬚の除去: ジャイナ教と仏教との対比. In: *Okuda Shōō sensei shōju kinen indogaku bukkyōgaku ronshū* 奥田聖應先生頌寿記念インド学仏教学論集. Tokyo: Kōsei shuppansha 佼成出版社, 334-349.

Sakurabe (Bunkyo) 櫻部文鏡, 1928: “*Chibetto ritten kenkyūi yohō* 西藏律典研究豫報.” *Ōtani gakuho* 大谷學報 9 (4), 805-824.

Sasaki (Kyōgo) 佐々木教悟, 1971: “Konpon setsuissai ubu to sankei mujyōkyō ni tsuite 根本説一切有部と三啓無常經について.” *Indogaku bukkyōgaku kenkyū* 印度学佛教學研究 19 (2), 81-88.

Sasaki (Shizuka) 佐々木閑, 1999: *Shukke towa nanika?* 出家とは何か? Tokyo: Daizō

shuppan 大蔵出版.

- , 2004: “A Problem in the Re-establishment of the *Bhikkunī Saṅgha* in Modern Theravāda Buddhism,” *The Eastern Buddhist* 36, 184–191.
- Schmidt (Michael), 1993: “Bhikṣuṇī-karmavācānā. Die Handschrift Sansk. c.25 (R) der Bodleian Library Oxford.” In: *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert zum 60. Geburtstag am 26. Juni 1992*, ed. R. Grunendahl et al. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 239–288.
- , 1994: “Zur Schulzugehörigkeit einer nepalesischen Handschrift der Bhikṣuṇī-Karmavācānā.” In: *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur*, bearbeitet von F. Bandurski et al. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 155–164.
- Schneider (Nicola), 2012: “The Ordination of *Dge slong ma*: A Challenge to Ritual Prescriptions?” In: *Revisiting Rituals in a Changing Tibetan World*. Edited by Katia Buffetrille. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 109–135.
- Schopen (Gregory), 1994: “Ritual Rights and Bones of Contention: More on Monastic Funerals and Relics in the *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya*.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 22, 31–80.
- , 1998: “Marking Time in Buddhist Monasteries: On Calendars, Clocks, and Some Liturgical Practices,” in *Sūryacandrāya. Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama on the Occasion of His 65th Birthday*, ed. by P. Harrison and G. Schopen. (Indica et Tibetica, 35). Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica, 157–179 (Reprinted in Schopen, *Buddhist Monks and Business Matters*, 2004, 260–284).
- , 2004: “On Buddhist Monks and Dreadful Deities: Some Monastic Devices for Updating the Dharma.” In: *Gedenkschrift J.W. de Jong*. Edited by H. W. Bodewitz and M. Hara. Tokyo: The International Institute for Buddhist Studies, 161–184.
- , 2008: “On Emptying Chamber Pots Without Looking and the Urban Location of Buddhist Nunneries in Early India Again.” *Journal Asiatique* 296 (2), 229–256.
- , 2010: “On Some Who Are Not Allowed to Become Buddhist Monks or Nuns: An Old List of Types of Slaves or Unfree Laborers.” *The Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 130 (2), 225–234.
- Simson (Georg von), 2000: *Prāmokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins*. Teil II. Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I, nach Vorarbeiten von Else Lüders und Herbert Härtel; herausgegeben von Georg von Simson, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Sobisch (Jan-Ulrich), 2002: *Three-Vow Theories in Tibetan Buddhism: A Comparative Study of Major Traditions from the Twelfth through Nineteenth Centuries*. Wiesbaden: Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag.

- Sujato (Bhikkhu), 2012: *Bhikkhuni Vinaya Studies: Research & Reflections on Monastic Discipline for Buddhist Nuns*. Australia: Santipada Publications. (An online pdf version has been available since, at the least, 2010 from <http://santifm.org/santipada/2010/bhikkhuni-vinaya-studies/>)
- Teramoto (Enga) 寺本婉雅, 1928: *Tāranātha Indo bukyō shi* ターラナータ 印度佛教史. (Chibetto den butten yakuchū bukyō kenkyū; dai 1 shū 西藏傳佛典譯註佛教研究; 第1輯) Tokyo: Heigo shuppansha 丙午出版社.
- Tokuoka (Ryōei) 徳岡亮英, 1960: “Indo bukyō ni okeru buha no seiritsu ni tsuite: Furauwarunā no kincho o yonde 印度仏教における部派の成立について：フラウワルナーの近著を読んで.” *Ōtani gakuho* 大谷学報 40 (3), 43-69.
- Tsedroen (Bhikṣuṇī Jampa) and Anālayo (Bhikkhu), 2013: “The *Gurudharma* on *Bhikṣuṇī* Ordination in the Mūlasarvāstivāda Tradition.” *Journal of Buddhist Ethics*. Vol. 20. Available from <http://blogs.dickinson.edu/buddhistethics/category/volume-20-2013/>
- Tsering (Tashi), 2010: “A Lamp of Vinaya Statements: A Concise Summary of Bhikṣuṇī Ordination.” In: *Dignity & Discipline*, 162-181.
- Than (Van Van), 2007: “Konma kara mita bikuni no jyukai sahō 羯磨から見た比丘尼の受戒作法,” *Indogaku bukyōgaku kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究56-1, 335-332.
- Vogel (Claus), 1985: “Bu-ston on the Schism of the Buddhist Church and on the Doctrinal Tendencies of Buddhist Scriptures.” In: *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*. Erster Teil (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung III, 1). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 104-110.
- Wei-chun, (Bhiksuni) 2007: “The Legal Procedures for the Mulasarvastivada Bhiksuni Ordination.” Paper delivered at the First International Congress on Buddhist Women’s Role in the Sa.ngha: Bhikshuni Vinaya and Ordination Lineages, University of Hamburg, July 18-20, 2007.
- Yamagiwa (Nobuyuki) 山極伸之1987: “*Konpon setsuissai uburitsu ni mirareru shukke sahō* 根本説一切有部律に見られる出家作法.” MA Thesis, Bukkyō University 佛教大学.
- Yonezawa (Yoshiyasu) 米澤嘉康, 2001: *Introduction to the Facsimile Edition of a Collection of Sanskrit Palm-leaf Manuscripts in Tibetan dBu med Script*. From http://www.tais.ac.jp/related/labo/sobutsu/sobutsu_book/vinayasutra.html